ACCEPTED FOR PROCESSING - 2022 April 8 3:24 PM - SCPSC - 2022-83-E - Page 1 of 3

From: Moser, Sandra
To: Jeannie
Cc: Hall, Roger; Bateman, Andrew; Samuel Wellborn; Katie Brown; Lisle Traywick; PSC_Contact
Subject: RE: [External] RE: Docket 2021-83-E (Jeannie Brown v. Duke Energy Progress, LLC)
Date: Friday, April 8, 2022 12:45:39 PM
Attachments: Pro Se Litigant Guide.pdf

Ms. Brown,

Thank you for your email. I appreciate you attaching the letter you sent to Mr. Hall and Mr. Bateman. It has been posted to the PSC's docket management system along with this email, in order to make sure that all parties have access to the correspondence.

Although it is not necessary for you to hire a lawyer for this matter, the complaint process can be complicated, and it is important to be mindful of the risks of self-representation. We will try to our best to answer any questions you may have. However, as an attorney for the Commission (and the Hearing Examiner for this case), I am unable to provide you with any legal advice. That said, please know that you can continue to contact us (by including all parties by email) if you have any questions. As you are aware, the Pro Se Litigant Guide (attached) is also available to help individuals such as yourself navigate this process and the rules we must follow.

I have noted that your response to the Motion to Dismiss. Your response is timely, and Duke will be allowed to respond within five days of service of the response, as stated in my previous email. The Commission will take up the matter of the Motion to Dismiss after everyone has had a chance to respond.

The Commission is always striving to make the complaint process smoother for lawyers and non-lawyers alike. We greatly appreciate your input and your suggestion regarding a link to the Pro Se Litigant Guide on the complaint forms. Thank you for your attention to this matter and for including all parties in your correspondence.

Sincerely,
Sandra

From: Jeannie <jbs.mail@sc.rr.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 7, 2022 4:16 PM
To: Moser, Sandra <Sandra.Moser@psc.sc.gov>
Cc: Hall, Roger <RHall@scconsumer.gov>; Bateman, Andrew <abateman@ors.sc.gov>; Samuel Wellborn <sam.wellborn@duke-energy.com>; Katie Brown <katie.brown2@duke-energy.com>; Lisle Traywick <ltraywick@robinsongray.com>; PSC_Contact <Contact@psc.sc.gov>
Subject: [External] RE: Docket 2021-83-E (Jeannie Brown v. Duke Energy Progress, LLC)

Dear Sandra Moser,

I have received all the correspondence from all parties. First, I am NOT a lawyer. The system the

Public Service Commission has in place is not designed for the typical consumer such as me. I was not advised that I should retain a lawyer for this complaint. I just happened to find the Pro Se Litigant Guide after the fact. A link to this guide should be on the same page as the complaint form.

Also I was never advised on the difference of a informal complaint and formal complaint by the people I talked to personally. I was also never provided with the Commission-approved tariff SLR-69. That being said I did send an email to Roger P. Hall and Andrew M. Bateman, which I did not receive a response from either one as per rules. I am attaching that email, so I am being "transparent" to all parties.

This will be my only response to the Motion to Dismiss Complaint. The stress of this is making me physically ill. I cannot understand where they "hid" the street light charge since 1979 and saying it was "included in the service line of the bill" doesn't make sense to me. I asked for clarification and was told it couldn't be provided.

I know this email is not in legal format, but as I stated "I am not a lawyer and will not pretend to act like a lawyer." If this case is dismissed, so be it. I am just an average American citizen at the mercy of a big utility company and cannot just cancel and move to another company.

Please find my attached email to R.Hall and A.Bateman. Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,
Jeannie P. Brown

From: "Moser, Sandra"
To: "jbs.mail@sc.rr.com", Roger", Andrew", "Samuel Wellborn", "Katie Brown", "Lisle Traywick"
Cc: "PSC_Contact"
Sent: Tuesday April 5 2022 4:44:01PM
Subject: Docket 2021-83-E (Jeannie Brown v. Duke Energy Progress, LLC)

Dear Parties of Record,

The Commission is in receipt of Duke Energy Progress, LLC's Verified Answer and Motion to Dismiss in the above-referenced docket. Pursuant to South Carolina Code Regulation 103-829, responses to motions are due within ten (10) days after service of said motions. According to Rule 6(e) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, parties served by mail are provided an additional five (5) days in which to respond. Therefore, please note that Complainant's (Ms. Brown's) response commenting on the Motion to Dismiss filed by Duke is due no later than April 12, 2022, which is fifteen (15) days after the date of service, March 28, 2022. Duke's Reply to the comments of Ms. Brown about its Motion to Dismiss must be filed with the Commission within five (5) days of service of the response. These times may be modified by order of the Commission or its designee for good cause.

ACCEPTED FOR PROCESSING - 2022 April 8 3:24 PM - SCPSC - 2022-83-E - Page 2 of 3

Included within Duke's Motion to Dismiss was also a request that the Commission hold in abeyance the filing deadlines for all parties and the hearing date pending resolution of its Motion to Dismiss. The Commission filed a response to that request last Friday (see attached), granting the request to stay all present filing deadlines as well as the hearing date. Therefore, the April 1, 2022 direct testimony deadline for Duke and ORS was stayed, and the April 8, 2022 deadline for the Complainant's response was also stayed. Further, the hearing date of June 14, 2022 has been stayed pending the outcome of the Motion to Dismiss.

The Commission will have the opportunity to issue its final ruling on the request after responses have been filed, and provide a new procedural schedule as necessary.

For service purposes, we will also be sending a copy of this email as well as the attached Chief Hearing Officer Directive, to the Complainant (Ms. Brown) by mail. Please do not hesitate to contact us by reply email which includes all parties of record if you have any questions or concerns. A copy of this email shall be filed in the Docket file for this matter as required by Commission policy.

Thank you,
Sandra

Sandra V. Moser
Commission Attorney
Public Service Commission
State of South Carolina
101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210
sandra.moser@psc.sc.gov
803-896-5100

ACCEPTED FOR PROCESSING - 2022 April 8 3:24 PM - SCPSC - 2022-83-E - Page 3 of 3