

complaint, directed to the person complained of and requiring that the matter complained of be satisfied, or that the complaint be answered in writing within ten (10) days from the date of service of the order, provided that the commission may require the answer to be filed within a shorter period if the complaint involves an emergency situation or otherwise would be detrimental to the public interest.

FINDINGS

The Commission finds that a complaint was first filed with the Commission in 2015. The facts in the record are that on March 26, 2015, Jonathan Creek District initially discovered the leak during its routine monthly meter reading. The utility initiated the contact regarding the leak with Mr. Wolter immediately upon its discovery of the leak. According to Mr. Walter's letter dated March 31, 2015, Mr. Wolter detected the leak on March 20, 2015, but did not notify Jonathan Creek District. Mr. Wolter had the leak repaired and then sent a letter requesting a payment plan. Based upon the record, Mr. Wolter was told he had a leak and the bill was in excess of \$6,000. He requested a payment plan and made three payments of \$540 per month in 2015. He filed an informal complaint with the Pubic Service Commission and requested the meter be tested. It was tested and passed. That complaint was closed. In February 2020, the utility contacted the Commission about beginning collections again and found the case had been closed. When Jonathan Creek District contacted Mr. Wolter, he filed this formal complaint. The Commission requested information to clarify the actions on the part of the utility and can find no indications of wrongdoing. The Commission is concerned about the amount of the monthly payments, as it seems rather high and would suggest it could be renegotiated. Mr. Wolter signed the agreement and filed a letter admitting to the leak. He has admitted owing the money and began repayment on the contract. Based upon its review of the record, the Commission finds that Mr. Wolter's complaint and

supporting documents do not present prima facie evidence of any wrongdoing on the part of Jonathan Creek District. Accordingly, the complaint should be dismissed and this case closed.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Lawrence J. Wolter's formal complaint is dismissed.
2. This case is closed and removed from the Commission's docket.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

By the Commission

ENTERED
JUL 28 2021 rcs
KENTUCKY PUBLIC
SERVICE COMMISSION

ATTEST:


Executive Director

Case No. 2020-00080

*Honorable Robert L. Prince
Attorney at Law
Prince & Brien, P.S.C.
P. O. Box 466
Benton, KENTUCKY 42025-0466

*Jonathan Creek Water District
7564 U. S. Highway 68E
P. O. Box 414
Benton, KY 42025

*Jonathan Creek Water District
Jonathan Creek Water District
7564 U. S. Highway 68E
P. O. Box 414
Benton, KY 42025

*Kip C. Mathis
Attorney
Johnson & Mathis Attorney at Law
1114 Main Street
P.O. Box 450
Benton, KENTUCKY 42025