BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

| GENE E DUDLEY SR., |) |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Complainant, |) |
| VS. |) No |
| KANSAS CITY POWER & Lights, |) |
| Defendant. |) |

DIRECT TESTIMONY

COMES NOW Complainant, pro se, and offers his initial Direct Testimony to Defendants KCP&L and avers that:

- 1. KCP&L should have reasonable known that having two individuals connected to same account and probably billing each consumer customer simultaneously violates their tariff.
- 2. According KCP&L representative having reviewed the Formal Complaint and subsequent matters related service restored at 4247 Agnes Avenue explained that each customer having their name(s) on that account requires all consent and plus authorization(s).
- 3. It would be fair to say that the records may support KCP&L ignored the requirement that a finding being frivolous or warranting consideration.
- 4. According to the Informal Complaint at the Commission stage Complainant maintained that identity theft played a part in billing process and debts KCP&L pursuit in collections. Complainant was incarcerated throughout 1998 until 2007. KCP&L relentlessly sought collect debts irrespective of the aforementioned. Somes addresses listed and associated with Complainant , i.e., a 4229 Tracy was listed in discovery. Also outstanding billing connected South Benton address negatively impacted customer requests for service.
- 5. Transferring of accounts while under review of the Commission and or deleting such accounts tends to indicate a degree of culpability. Continuing kind of practice existed in relation to several addresses connected to Complainant.

- 6. KCP&L records verifies collection of debts notwithstanding action pending ,i.e., interest rates or past due charges.
- 7. Litmus test argued by KCP&L maintains that proof is established as long as other utilities were in that customer consumer's names, meaning that customer "benefitted." KCP&L operating under principle and standards as set forth in their tariff and that of the regulating agency (PSC) it reads "substantially benefitted" what that standard dictates. This litmus test was applied to Garfield and Paseo Avenue addresses.