

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Initiation of formal proceedings of
Complaint No. 1006767E of Edward
McDonald against Tampa Electric Company,
for alleged improper billing.

DOCKET NO. 110305-EI
ORDER NO. PSC-13-0136-FOF-EI
ISSUED: March 20, 2013

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of this matter:

RONALD A. BRISÉ, Chairman
LISA POLAK EDGAR
ART GRAHAM
EDUARDO E. BALBIS
JULIE I. BROWN

ORDER DENYING AMENDED MOTION FOR STAY

BY THE COMMISSION:

CASE BACKGROUND

On November 4, 2011, Mr. Edward McDonald (Mr. McDonald) filed a formal complaint (Complaint) against Tampa Electric Company (TECO) asserting that (1) he did not owe TECO the \$915.94 shown as an outstanding balance on his account and (2) TECO owed him \$3,500 in alleged overpayments and \$5,000 in alleged attorneys' fees he incurred in circuit court. TECO offered Mr. McDonald a settlement regarding the outstanding \$915.94 which Mr. McDonald rejected. On February 7, 2012, by Proposed Agency Action Order No. PSC-12-0053-PAA-EI, (PAA Order) we denied Mr. McDonald's request for relief.

On February 29, 2012, Mr. McDonald filed a pleading entitled, "Initiation of Formal Proceedings," (Initial Petition) protesting the PAA Order and requesting a formal hearing. On May 23, 2012, by Order No. PSC-12-0252-FOF-EI, we dismissed Mr. McDonald's request for a formal hearing for failure to state a cause of action and nonconformance with Rule 28-106.201, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.).

On June 12, 2012, Mr. McDonald filed an Amended Petition. On September 21, 2012, by Order No. PSC-12-0485-FOF-EI, we dismissed Mr. McDonald's Amended Petition with prejudice for failure to cure the defects of the Initial Petition. On September 24, 2012, Consummating Order No. PSC-12-0489-CO-EI was issued, closing this docket and the Complaint. Mr. McDonald's services were disconnected after the docket was closed.

On October 8, 2012, Mr. McDonald filed a Request for Oral Argument, Motion for Reconsideration, and a Motion to Stay the Proceedings (Motion for Reconsideration and Stay). On October 11, 2012, TECO filed its response to the Motion for Reconsideration and Stay (TECO's Response). TECO did not request oral argument. On October 17, 2012, Mr.

DOCUMENT NUMBER DATE

01397 MAR 20 2013

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

McDonald filed a Motion to Strike TECO's Response. On October 16, 2012, Mr. McDonald filed another complaint (Second Complaint) based on the same facts in this docket regarding disconnection of his services. He alleged that the interruption of service was without the required five days disconnection notice in violation of Rule 25-6.005, F.A.C. He also alleged that his bill was inaccurate and that his reconnection fees were excessive. However, he requested no relief.

On October 22, 2012, TECO filed a letter in response to Mr. McDonald's Second Complaint regarding the interruption of services (TECO's Letter). TECO asserted that it was not served a copy of the Second Complaint but stated that the disconnection was in compliance with this Commission's rules, and that Mr. McDonald's services were reconnected that same day after he paid the outstanding balance on his account.

On October 30, 2012, Mr. McDonald filed a response to TECO's Letter (McDonald's October 30, 2012 Response) in which Mr. McDonald asserted that the Second Complaint (regarding the disconnection of services) should be severed from this docket because it alleges impermissible conduct by TECO and disputed billing amounts. On November 6, 2012, Mr. McDonald submitted a letter (McDonald's Letter) in which he stated that TECO's representative acknowledged that the bill was inaccurate and that the disconnection notice did not conform to our rules as he alleged in his Second Complaint.

On November 7, 2012, TECO filed its response to McDonald's Letter (TECO's Second Response) in which TECO stated that its representative did not acknowledge anything to Mr. McDonald. Instead, its representative's contact with Mr. McDonald was to explain his payment obligations. On November 16, 2012, Mr. McDonald filed a notice of filing complaint (Notice).

On December 31, 2012, by Order No PSC-12-0668-FOF-EI, we dismissed Mr. McDonald's Second Complaint with prejudice and denied his motion for reconsideration, motion to stay proceeding and motion to strike. The Second Complaint was determined to be "directly related to issues resolved in this docket" and barred by the doctrine of administrative finality.¹

On December 21, 2012, Mr. McDonald filed an Amended Motion for Stay Pending Judicial Review (Amended Motion for Stay) in which he asks us to stay our "decision rendered on December 10, 2012."² In his Amended Motion for Stay, Mr. McDonald asks that bond be waived and alleges that he will suffer irreparable harm if TECO is allowed to interrupt his service because he is 75 years old with declining health and electric service is medically necessary. TECO did not respond to the Amended Motion for Stay.

On January 30, 2013, Mr. McDonald filed his Notice of Appeal. The Florida Supreme Court has assigned the Appeal Case Number SC13-160. Mr. McDonald's Amended Motion for Stay is the subject of this Order. We are vested with jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Chapters 120 and 366, Florida Statutes (F.S.), and Rule 25-22.061, F.A.C.

¹ Order No PSC-12-0668-FOF-EI, issued December 31, 2012, at 4-5.

² *Memorialized in* Order No. PSC-12-0668-FOF-EI.

ANALYSIS AND RULING

Standard of Review

Rule 25.22.061(2), F.A.C., authorizes the filing of a petition for stay pending judicial review. This Commission has authority to grant, modify, or deny such relief and such relief “may be conditioned upon the posting of a good and sufficient bond . . . , other conditions relevant to the order being stayed, or both.” In evaluating the request for a stay, we may consider, among other things, the following:

- (a) Whether the petitioner has demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits on appeal;
- (b) Whether the petitioner has demonstrated a likelihood of sustaining irreparable harm if the stay is not granted; and
- (c) Whether the delay in implementing the order will likely cause substantial harm or be contrary to the public interest if the stay is granted.³

Analysis

We will evaluate the Amended Motion for Stay in accordance with the applicable standards.

Likelihood of Success on Appeal

In his Amended Motion for Stay, Mr. McDonald does not develop any argument regarding the likelihood of his success on appeal. However, the history of this matter is informative on that subject. In granting TECO’s Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice, we determined the following:

Section 120.569(2)(c), F.S., dictates that the dismissal of a petition should, at least once, be without prejudice to petitioner’s filing a timely amended petition curing the defect, unless it conclusively appears from the face of the petition that the defect cannot be cured. The original petition was dismissed without prejudice for failure to state a cause of action and for its nonconformance with Rule 28-106.201, F.A.C. The amended petition fails to cure the deficiencies of the original petition.

We find that the deficiencies are incurable for the following reasons: (1) the petition requested damages and our regulatory oversight of TECO does not include the award of damages; (2) the Petitioner has not alleged the violation of any applicable statutes or rules applicable to the regulation of TECO; and (3) the amended petition fails to substantially conform to the pleading requirements of Rule 28-106.201, F.A.C. Therefore, we find it

³ Rule 25.22.016(2), F.A.C.

appropriate to dismiss the amended petition with prejudice.⁴

In denying Mr. McDonald's Motion for Reconsideration of the order quoted above, we found that Mr. McDonald had failed "to identify any errors or omissions . . . that require modification to or reversal of the order"⁵ and found "no legal basis for staying the proceedings"⁶ at that time. Upon review, we find that the Amended Motion for Stay is similarly lacking and does not demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits on appeal.

Likelihood of Sustaining Irreparable Harm

Mr. McDonald *does assert* that, based on his alleged medical conditions, he would suffer irreparable harm if TECO were permitted to interrupt his service. However, Mr. McDonald *does not assert* that he is unable to pay his bill to avoid such disconnection. Moreover, in Mr. McDonald's October 30, 2012 Response, he acknowledges that his service had been disconnected and does not dispute language in TECO's Letter, attached thereto, reflecting that, "[a]fter the disconnection Mr. McDonald, on the same day, paid the new past due amount and his electric service was thereupon reconnected." This series of events is reflected in our Order Denying Reconsideration.⁷ Finally, should Mr. McDonald prevail on appeal, a refund of money could still be made. Upon review, we find that Mr. McDonald has not been persuasive in his argument that he will suffer irreparable harm if a stay is not granted.

Public Interest

The Amended Motion for Stay does not address any potential harm or public interest considerations.

Ruling

Upon review, the Amended Motion for Stay shall be denied.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that Mr. McDonald's Amended Motion for Stay Pending Judicial Review is hereby denied. It is further,

⁴ Order No. PSC-12-0485-FOF-EI, at 4.

⁵ Order No. PSC-12-0668-FOF-EI, at 5.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ See Order No PSC- 12-0668-FOF-EI, at 2.

ORDERED that this docket shall remain open during the pendency of Mr. McDonald's appeal.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 20th day of March, 2013.



ANN COLE
Commission Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 413-6770
www.floridapsc.com

Copies furnished: A copy of this document is provided to the parties of record at the time of issuance and, if applicable, interested persons.

LDH

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Pursuant to Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure 9.190(e)(2)(A) and 9.310(f), review of the Commission's decision regarding a stay shall be to the appellate court upon motion. Any such motion must comply with Florida Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.300(a).