

STATE OF INDIANA

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF THE)
TOWN OF WINFIELD, LAKE COUNTY, INDIANA,)
FOR APPROVAL OF A REGULATORY)
ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A SERVICE) CAUSE NO. 45992
TERRITORY FOR THE TOWN'S MUNICIPAL)
SEWER SYSTEM PURSUANT TO IND. CODE § 8-)
1.5-6 ET. SEQ.)

**THE CITY OF CROWN POINT, INDIANA'S MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE**

The City of Crown Point, Indiana ("Crown Point"), by counsel, with the consent of all the parties except the Town of Winfield, Indiana ("Winfield" or "Petitioner"), files the following Motion for Extension of Procedural Schedule ("Motion") and respectfully requests that the Presiding Officers adopt the procedural schedule proposed herein. In support of this Motion, Crown Point states as follows:

1. On March 20, 2025, Crown Point served its First Set of Discovery Requests to Winfield ("Data Requests"). Winfield's responses to the Data Requests were due on or before March 31, 2025.
2. On March 28, 2025, one business day before the deadline for Winfield to respond to the Data Requests, Winfield filed a Motion for Extension of Time, requesting an extension of time until April 30, 2025 to respond to Crown Point's Data Requests. Crown Point filed its Response to the Motion for Extension of Time on April 1, 2025, and Winfield filed its Reply in support of the Motion for Extension of Time on April 4, 2025. The Motion for Extension of Time remains pending.
3. On April 24, 2025, the Presiding Officers held an Attorneys' Conference in this Cause via Microsoft Teams (the "April 24 Attorneys' Conference") to discuss the status of

discovery, among other things.

4. During the April 24 Attorneys' Conference, junior counsel for Winfield represented that Winfield would provide some responses and objections to Crown Point's Data Requests by April 30, 2025 and the remainder of the responses and objections by May 7, 2025.

5. Crown Point's counsel was unaware that Winfield was not planning to respond to all of its discovery responses by April 30, as its counsel had previously represented, until Winfield's and Crown Point's counsel spoke on the morning of the April 24 Attorneys' Conference.

6. All counsel present at the April 24 Attorneys' Conference stated that they agreed that a 50-day extension of time of the procedural schedule in this Cause, approximately equal to the time between March 20, 2025 (when Crown Point served its Data Requests) and May 7, 2025 (the date when Winfield represented that it would finish providing responses and/or objections to the Data Requests), was reasonable and fair.

7. All counsel also agreed to work toward filing an agreed motion for the 50-day extension of the procedural schedule no later than May 1, 2025.

8. On April 30, 2025, Crown Point's counsel circulated to all counsel via email a proposed extended procedural schedule per the discussion at the Attorneys' Conference. A compilation of the emails between the parties that followed is attached hereto.

9. Notwithstanding the agreement reached at the April 24 Attorneys' Conference, on April 30 Winfield's senior counsel responded, "Mark: it is not clear to my [sic] why a fifty day extension is necessary. This case has drug on too long. We will object to such a long extension." Attachment at 4. In a follow-up email, Winfield's senior counsel stated, "Maybe my math is messed up, but please explain how the discovery 'has been outstanding for' 50 days. In addition,

we had no authority at that time to agree to such an extension.” *Id.* at 3. Winfield’s senior counsel also claimed that “the vast majority of the questions were fully or at least partially addressed in our prefiled testimony and exhibits.” *Id.*

10. Until April 30, 2025, the other parties were completely unaware that Winfield’s counsel was apparently *not* willing to work with them on an agreed 50-day extension of the procedural schedule, as Winfield’s junior counsel had represented to the Presiding Officers during the April 24 Attorneys’ Conference.

11. Had Crown Point known that Winfield’s senior counsel would ultimately object to the proposed extension of the procedural schedule, it would have sought a ruling on this procedural extension from the Presiding Officers during the April 24 Attorneys’ Conference. Instead, Winfield’s attorneys waited nearly a week to ambush the other parties’ counsel with their objection the day before the parties were due to file a proposed schedule with the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (“Commission”).

12. After 11 p.m. on April 30, 2025, Winfield served its obviously hurried and partial written responses and objections to all of Crown Point’s Data Requests.

13. On May 1, 2025, counsel for Crown Point contacted counsel for Winfield, stating that Crown Point was willing to agree to a procedural schedule extension of 43 days (instead of the 50 days discussed during the April 24 Attorneys’ Conference), see Attachment at 2, since the time between March 20, 2025, when Crown Point’s Data Requests were served, and April 30, 2025, when Winfield provided responses,¹ is approximately equal to 43 days. Winfield’s senior counsel declined to agree to this and stated that his client is “vehemently opposed to any sort of

¹ Through this acknowledgement that Winfield did serve responses and objections to its Data Requests late in the evening on April 30, 2025, Crown Point does not admit or agree that these responses were adequate or complete and reserves the right to file a Motion to Compel Discovery, if necessary.

extension.” *Id.* at 1.

14. Winfield’s failure to respond to Crown Point’s Data Requests for 41 days after they were served (without its Motion for Extension of Time being granted by the Commission) effectively prevented Crown Point from presenting a full case in its case-in-chief testimony, which it filed on the due date of April 21, 2025. It has also prejudiced Crown Point’s ability to prepare its responsive testimony that is due June 2, 2025. In the interest of fairness, the Commission should extend the procedural schedule by the number of days that Winfield took to respond to Crown Point’s discovery.

15. Notably, in its Response to Winfield’s Motion for Extension of Time, Crown Point requested that all procedural deadlines in this case be extended if the Commission were to grant Winfield’s thirty-day Motion for Extension of Time to respond to discovery. Winfield responded that while it did not believe such relief was necessary, “***Winfield would understand if the Commission were to find it appropriate to adjust the procedural schedule upon granting Winfield’s request.***” Winfield’s Reply to Motion for Extension of Time at 3, ¶ 13 (emphasis added). Now, having taken the additional thirty-day extension of time without receiving approval from the Commission, Winfield objects to Crown Point getting an extension. In other words, Winfield has *twice* agreed that granting an extension of time is a fair or understandable result of its delay in responding to discovery, but now objects to that relief. Such a result is prejudicial, unreasonable and should be rejected.

16. For these reasons, Crown Point respectfully requests that the Presiding Officers adopt the following procedural schedule for the remaining deadlines in this Cause, which is an approximately 43-day extension of time of all remaining deadlines and of the evidentiary hearing. This request is consistent with the discussions held during the April 24 Attorneys’ Conference,

during which the Presiding Officers and all parties acknowledged that an extension of the procedural schedule reflecting the approximate length of time Winfield took to respond to Crown Point's discovery requests would be appropriate.

Proposed Procedural Schedule

A. Issues Related to the Overlapping Territory between Winfield and Crown Point.

1. OUCC's and Intervenors' Prefiling Date. The OUCC and all Intervenors, except Crown Point, shall prefile with the Commission the prepared testimony and exhibits constituting their respective cases-in-chief on or before July 15, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

2. Winfield's and Crown Point's Response Prefiling Date. Winfield and Crown Point shall prefile responsive testimony and exhibits to each other's case-in-chief filing on or before July 15, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

3. Rebuttal and Cross-Answering Prefiling Date. Winfield and Crown Point shall prefile their prepared rebuttal testimony on or before August 14, 2025. The OUCC and all other Intervenors shall prefile their respective cross-answering testimony and exhibits, if any, on or before August 14, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

B. All Other Issues Related to Winfield's Regulatory Ordinance.

1. OUCC's and Intervenors' Prefiling Date. The OUCC and all Intervenors shall prefile with the Commission the prepared testimony and exhibits constituting their respective cases-in-chief on or before July 15, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

2. Winfield's Rebuttal Prefiling Date. Winfield shall prefile its rebuttal testimony

on or before August 14, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

C. Remaining Procedural Requirements.

1. Evidentiary Hearing. An evidentiary hearing shall occur on or about September 4, 2025 in Room 222 of the PNC Center, 101 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana.

2. Post-Hearing Filings. All parties shall file their proposed orders and any briefs in support thereof on or before October 2, 2025. Any parties may file a reply to the post-hearing filings on or before November 3, 2025.

WHEREFORE, Crown Point respectfully requests that the Commission grant all relief requested in this Motion, implement the proposed procedural schedule contained herein, and grant any other relief it finds appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark W. Cooper
Mark W. Cooper, Attorney for Crown Point

/s/ Robert M. Glennon
Robert M. Glennon, Attorney for Crown Point

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following counsel of record by electronic mail this 1st day of May, 2025:

Daniel LeVay
Victor Peters
Office of Utility Consumer Counselor
115 W. Washington St., Suite 1500 South
Indianapolis, IN 46204
dlevay@oucc.in.gov
ViPeters@oucc.in.gov
infomgt@oucc.in.gov

J. Christopher Janak
Greg Loyd
Jacob Antrim
Bose McKinney & Evans LLP
11 South Meridian Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204
cjanak@boselaw.com
gloyd@boselaw.com
jantrim@boselaw.com

David Austgen
Austgen Kuiper Jasaitis P.C.
akapc@austgenlaw.com

Brett R. Galvan
121 N. Main Street
Hebron, IN 46341
brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com

Steven W. Krohne
Jennifer L. Schuster
Jack M. Petr
Ice Miller LLP
One American Square, Suite 2900
Indianapolis, Indiana 46282-0200
steven.krohne@icemiller.com
jennifer.schuster@icemiller.com
jack.petr@icemiller.com

/s/ Mark W. Cooper
Mark Cooper, Attorney at Law

Robert Glennon & Associates
3697 N. 500 E
Danville IN. 46122
(317) 694-4025
robertglennonlaw@gmail.com

Mark W. Cooper
Attorney at Law
1449 N. College Ave.
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(317) 635-8312
Fax: (317) 685-2666
attymcooper@indy.rr.com

From: [Janak, J. Christopher](#)
To: attymcooper@indy.rr.com; [Krohne, Steven](#); ["Le Vay, Daniel"](#); ["Peters, Victor"](#); ["UCC Info Mgt"](#); akapc@austgenlaw.com; [Loyd, Greg S.](#); [Antrim, Jacob T.](#); brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com; [Schuster, Jennifer](#); [Petr, Jack](#); jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com; ["Kile, Nicholas"](#); Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com; ["Lauren Aguilar"](#); ["Lauren M. Box"](#)
Cc: ["Robert M. Glennon"](#); ["Willoughby, Kristen L."](#); ["Bell, Scott"](#)
Subject: RE: 50-day extension schedule in 45992 and 46035
Date: Thursday, May 1, 2025 1:17:52 PM

Mark, While I did not participate, I understood two things from the attorney's conference. First, Winfield would try to provide a response to the Discovery by April 30, but certainly no later than May 7. Second, neither Crown Point, nor Winfield could agree to the extension without first speaking to their clients.

As to the first issue, Winfield provided its response to Crown Point's request on April 30, 2025. This is almost five weeks before your next round of testimony is due.

In addition, Greg and I have talked to our client and they are vehemently opposed to any sort of extension. This case has been pending for almost 18 months. Crown Point has been an intervenor for more than a year. Crown Point waited until a few weeks before its testimony is due to send a 108 page data request, most of which sought information that was provided to Crown Point as part of Winfield's our prefilng on April 21, 2025.

Crown Point now claims that it needs an additional 50 or 43 days to prepare its responsive testimony? Please explain the need for the additional time when Crown Point has had the information for significant period of time.

Please let me know your thoughts at your earliest convenience.

Chris

J. Christopher Janak

Bose McKinney & Evans LLP

111 Monument Circle | Suite 2700 | Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

cjanak@boselaw.com | P 317-684-5249 | F 317-223-0249

Assistant Contact | Candice Lowes | clowes@boselaw.com | P 317-684-5248 | F 317-223-0248

Bose McKinney & Evans LLP is a member of [Mackrell International](#), a network of independent law firms from more than sixty countries and thirty states.

From: attymcooper@indy.rr.com <attymcooper@indy.rr.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 1, 2025 11:33 AM

To: Janak, J. Christopher <cjanak@boselaw.com>; Steven.Krohne@icemiller.com; 'Le Vay, Daniel' <dlevay@oucc.IN.gov>; 'Peters, Victor' <ViPeters@oucc.IN.gov>; 'UCC Info Mgt'

<Infomgt@oucc.IN.gov>; akapc@austgenlaw.com; Loyd, Greg S. <gloyd@boselaw.com>; Antrim, Jacob T. <jantrim@boselaw.com>; brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com; Jennifer.Schuster@icemiller.com; Jack.Petr@icemiller.com; jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com; 'Kile, Nicholas' <nicholas.kile@btlaw.com>; Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com; 'Lauren Aguilar' <lauren.aguilar@btlaw.com>; 'Lauren M. Box' <lauren.box@btlaw.com>

Cc: 'Robert M. Glennon' <robertglennonlaw@gmail.com>; 'Willoughby, Kristen L' <KWilloughby@oucc.IN.gov>; 'Bell, Scott' <sbell@oucc.IN.gov>; attymcooper@indy.rr.com

Subject: RE: 50-day extension schedule in 45992 and 46035

Chris,

At the Attorney's Conference last week, Greg told us that you needed until May 7 to respond to Crown Point's First DR Set. Based on the receipt of the, partially responsive, Responses which you provided to Crown Point's First DR Set late last night, we suggest shortening the schedule extension from 50 days to 43 days. Which would be in line with the agreement reached at the Attorney's Conference. Would that be agreeable to you?

Please advise.

Mark

Mark W. Cooper
Attorney at Law
1449 North College Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46202
Phone: 317-635-8312
Fax: 317-685-2666
Email: attymcooper@indy.rr.com

From: Janak, J. Christopher <cjanak@boselaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 3:12 PM

To: Steven.Krohne@icemiller.com; Le Vay, Daniel <dlevay@oucc.IN.gov>; attymcooper@indy.rr.com; Peters, Victor <ViPeters@oucc.IN.gov>; UCC Info Mgt <Infomgt@oucc.IN.gov>; akapc@austgenlaw.com; Loyd, Greg S. <gloyd@boselaw.com>; Antrim, Jacob T. <jantrim@boselaw.com>; brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com; Jennifer.Schuster@icemiller.com; Jack.Petr@icemiller.com; jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com; 'Kile, Nicholas' <nicholas.kile@btlaw.com>; Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com; Lauren Aguilar <lauren.aguilar@btlaw.com>; Lauren M. Box <lauren.box@btlaw.com>

Cc: Robert M. Glennon <robertglennonlaw@gmail.com>; Willoughby, Kristen L <KWilloughby@oucc.IN.gov>; Bell, Scott <sbell@oucc.IN.gov>

Subject: RE: 50-day extension schedule in 45992 and 46035

Steve: I disagree. Maybe my math is messed up, but please explain how the discovery "has been outstanding for" 50 days. In addition, we had no authority at that time to agree to such an extension.

From: [Janak, J. Christopher](#)
To: [Krohne, Steven](#); [Le Vay, Daniel](#); attymcooper@indy.rr.com; [Peters, Victor](#); [UCC Info Mgt](#); akapc@austgenlaw.com; [Loyd, Greg S.](#); [Antrim, Jacob T.](#); brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com; [Schuster, Jennifer](#); [Petr, Jack](#); jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com; ["Kile, Nicholas"](#); Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com; [Lauren Aguilar](#); [Lauren M. Box](#)
Cc: [Robert M. Glennon](#); [Willoughby, Kristen L](#); [Bell, Scott](#)
Subject: RE: 50-day extension schedule in 45992 and 46035
Date: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 3:14:29 PM

In addition to my comments below, the vast majority of the questions were fully or at least partially addressed in our prefiled testimony and exhibits.

Chris.

J. Christopher Janak

Bose McKinney & Evans LLP

111 Monument Circle | Suite 2700 | Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

cjanak@boselaw.com | P 317-684-5249 | F 317-223-0249

Assistant Contact | [Candice Lowes](#) | clowes@boselaw.com | P 317-684-5248 | F 317-223-0248

Bose McKinney & Evans LLP is a member of [Mackrell International](#), a network of independent law firms from more than sixty countries and thirty states.

From: Janak, J. Christopher

Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 3:12 PM

To: Steven.Krohne@icemiller.com; Le Vay, Daniel <dlevay@oucc.IN.gov>; attymcooper@indy.rr.com; Peters, Victor <ViPeters@oucc.IN.gov>; [UCC Info Mgt <Infomgt@oucc.IN.gov>](#); akapc@austgenlaw.com; Loyd, Greg S. <gloyd@boselaw.com>; [Antrim, Jacob T. <jantrim@boselaw.com>](#); brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com; Jennifer.Schuster@icemiller.com; Jack.Petr@icemiller.com; jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com; ["Kile, Nicholas" <nicholas.kile@btlaw.com>](mailto:'Kile, Nicholas' <nicholas.kile@btlaw.com>); Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com; Lauren Aguilar <lauren.aguilar@btlaw.com>; Lauren M. Box <lauren.box@btlaw.com>

Cc: Robert M. Glennon <robertglennonlaw@gmail.com>; Willoughby, Kristen L <KWilloughby@oucc.IN.gov>; Bell, Scott <sbell@oucc.IN.gov>

Subject: RE: 50-day extension schedule in 45992 and 46035

Steve: I disagree. Maybe my math is messed up, but please explain how the discovery “has been outstanding for” 50 days. In addition, we had no authority at that time to agree to such an extension.

J. Christopher Janak

Bose McKinney & Evans LLP

111 Monument Circle | Suite 2700 | Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

cjanak@boselaw.com | P 317-684-5249 | F 317-223-0249

Assistant Contact | [Candice Lowes](#) | clowes@boselaw.com | P 317-684-5248 | F 317-223-0248

Bose McKinney & Evans LLP is a member of [Mackrell International](#), a network of independent law firms from more than sixty countries and thirty states.

From: Steven.Krohne@icemiller.com <Steven.Krohne@icemiller.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 3:02 PM

To: Janak, J. Christopher <cjanak@boselaw.com>; Le Vay, Daniel <dlevay@oucc.IN.gov>; attymcooper@indy.rr.com; Peters, Victor <ViPeters@oucc.IN.gov>; UCC Info Mgt <Infomgt@oucc.IN.gov>; akapc@austgenlaw.com; Loyd, Greg S. <gloyd@boselaw.com>; Antrim, Jacob T. <jantrim@boselaw.com>; brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com; Jennifer.Schuster@icemiller.com; Jack.Petr@icemiller.com; jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com; 'Kile, Nicholas' <nicholas.kile@btlaw.com>; Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com; Lauren Aguilar <lauren.aguilar@btlaw.com>; Lauren M. Box <lauren.box@btlaw.com>

Cc: Robert M. Glennon <robertglennonlaw@gmail.com>; Willoughby, Kristen L <KWilloughby@oucc.IN.gov>; Bell, Scott <sbell@oucc.IN.gov>

Subject: Re: 50-day extension schedule in 45992 and 46035

Chris,

The parties, including Winfield, agreed to the extension during the attorneys' conference because discovery has been outstanding for the same period.

Steve

Get Outlook for iOS<<https://aka.ms/o0ukef>>

From: Janak, J. Christopher <cjanak@boselaw.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 2:57 PM

To: Le Vay, Daniel <dlevay@oucc.IN.gov>; attymcooper@indy.rr.com <attymcooper@indy.rr.com>; Peters, Victor <ViPeters@oucc.IN.gov>; UCC Info Mgt <Infomgt@oucc.IN.gov>; akapc@austgenlaw.com <akapc@austgenlaw.com>; Loyd, Greg S. <gloyd@boselaw.com>; Antrim, Jacob T. <jantrim@boselaw.com>; brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com <brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com>; Krohne, Steven <Steven.Krohne@icemiller.com>; Schuster, Jennifer <Jennifer.Schuster@icemiller.com>; Petr, Jack <Jack.Petr@icemiller.com>; jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com <jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com>; 'Kile, Nicholas' <nicholas.kile@btlaw.com>; Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com <Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com>; Lauren Aguilar <lauren.aguilar@btlaw.com>; Lauren M. Box <lauren.box@btlaw.com>

Cc: Robert M. Glennon <robertglennonlaw@gmail.com>; Willoughby, Kristen L <KWilloughby@oucc.IN.gov>; Bell, Scott <sbell@oucc.IN.gov>

Subject: RE: 50-day extension schedule in 45992 and 46035

Mark: it is not clear to my why a fifty day extension is necessary. This case has drug on too long. We will object to such a long extension.

Chris.

J. Christopher Janak
 Bose McKinney & Evans LLP
 111 Monument Circle | Suite 2700 | Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
 cjanak@boselaw.com<mailto:cjanak@boselaw.com> | P 317-684-5249 | F 317-223-0249

Assistant Contact | Candice Lowes |
 clowes@boselaw.com<mailto:clowes@boselaw.com> | P 317-684-5248 | F 317-223-0248

Bose McKinney & Evans LLP is a member of Mackrell International<<https://www.mackrell.net>>, a network of independent law firms from more than sixty countries and thirty states.

From: Le Vay, Daniel <dlevay@oucc.IN.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 2:53 PM

To: attymcooper@indy.rr.com; Peters, Victor <ViPeters@oucc.IN.gov>; UCC Info Mgt <Infomgt@oucc.IN.gov>; akapc@austgenlaw.com; Janak, J. Christopher <cjanak@boselaw.com>; Loyd, Greg S. <gloyd@boselaw.com>; Antrim, Jacob T. <jantrim@boselaw.com>; brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com; Steven.Krohne@icemiller.com; Jennifer.Schuster@icemiller.com; Jack.Petr@icemiller.com; jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com; 'Kile, Nicholas' <nicholas.kile@btlaw.com>; Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com; Lauren Aguilar <lauren.aguilar@btlaw.com>; Lauren M. Box <lauren.box@btlaw.com>

Cc: Robert M. Glennon <robertglennonlaw@gmail.com>; Willoughby, Kristen L <KWilloughby@oucc.IN.gov>; Bell, Scott <sbell@oucc.IN.gov>

Subject: RE: 50-day extension schedule in 45992 and 46035

Mark – I am checking for conflicts. Please be advised that the OUCC is unlikely to file a proposed order but may file a response to others' proposed orders. Parties who have filed a proposed order may want an opportunity to reply to those who like the OUCC have only submitted a reply. I have no objection to your building that opportunity into the schedule. -Dan

From: attymcooper@indy.rr.com <attymcooper@indy.rr.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2025 1:05 PM

To: Le Vay, Daniel <dlevay@oucc.IN.gov>; Peters, Victor <ViPeters@oucc.IN.gov>; UCC Info Mgt <Infomgt@oucc.IN.gov>; akapc@austgenlaw.com; cjanak@boselaw.com; 'Loyd, Greg S.' <gloyd@boselaw.com>; 'Antrim, Jacob T.' <jantrim@boselaw.com>;

brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com; Steven.Krohne@icemiller.com;
Jennifer.Schuster@icemiller.com; Jack.Petr@icemiller.com;
jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com; 'Kile, Nicholas' <nicholas.kile@btlaw.com>;
Hillary.Close@BTLaw.com; Lauren Aguilar <lauren.aguilar@btlaw.com>; Lauren M. Box
<lauren.box@btlaw.com>
Cc: Robert M. Glennon <robertglennonlaw@gmail.com>; attymcooper@indy.rr.com
Subject: 50-day extension schedule in 45992 and 46035

EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email was sent from outside your organization. Exercise caution when clicking links, opening attachments or taking further action, before validating its authenticity.

Counsel,

Based on the discussion at the 4-24 Attorney's Conference, Crown Point proposes extending the procedural schedules in Causes 45992 and 46035 by about fifty (50) days.

Below, please see the proposed dates incorporated into text similar to the, respective, scheduling orders.

Please let us have your comments.

Mark W. Cooper
Attorney at Law
1449 North College Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46202
Phone: 317-635-8312
Fax: 317-685-2666
Email: attymcooper@indy.rr.com<mailto:attymcooper@indy.rr.com>

Cause No. 45992:

1. Issues Related to the Overlapping Territory between Winfield and Crown Point.

OUCC's and Intervenors' Prefiling Date. The OUCC and all Intervenors, except Crown Point, shall prefile with the Commission the prepared testimony and exhibits constituting their respective cases-in-chief on or before July 22, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

Winfield's and Crown Point's Response Prefiling Date. Winfield and Crown Point shall prefile responsive testimony and exhibits to each other's case-in-chief filing on or before July 22, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

Rebuttal and Cross-Answering Prefiling Date. Winfield and Crown Point shall prefile their prepared rebuttal testimony on or before August 21, 2025. The OUCC and all other Intervenors shall prefile their respective cross-answering testimony and exhibits, if any, on or before August 21, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

1. All Other Issues Related to Winfield's Regulatory Ordinance.

OUCC's and Intervenors' Prefiling Date. The OUCC and all Intervenors shall prefile with the Commission the prepared testimony and exhibits constituting their respective cases-in-chief on or before July 22, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

Winfield's Rebuttal Prefiling Date. Winfield shall prefile its rebuttal testimony on or before August 21, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

1. Remaining Procedural Requirements.

Evidentiary Hearing. An evidentiary hearing is scheduled to commence at time TBD on September 11, 2025 in Room 222 of the PNC Center, 101 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana. If the parties reach settlement, the agreement and supporting testimony and exhibits shall be submitted to the Commission ten business days prior to the evidentiary hearing.

Post-Hearing Filings. All parties shall file its proposed order and any brief in support thereof on or before October 9, 2025. Any parties may file a reply to the post-hearing filings on or before November 17, 2025.

Cause No. 46035:

OUCC's and Intervenors' Prefiling Date. The OUCC and all Intervenors shall prefile with the Commission the prepared testimony and exhibits constituting their respective cases-in-chief on or before July 22, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

Rebuttal and Cross-Answering Prefiling Date. Petitioner shall prefile with the Commission its prepared rebuttal testimony on or before August 21, 2025, and the OUCC, and all Intervenors shall also prefile their respective cross-answering testimony and exhibits, if any, on or before August 21, 2025. Copies of same shall be served upon all parties of record.

Evidentiary Hearing. The cases-in-chief of Petitioner, the OUCC, and any intervenors shall be presented in an evidentiary hearing to commence at time TBD on September 12, 2025 in Room 222 of the PNC Center, 101 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Post-Hearing Filings. All parties shall file its proposed order and any brief in support thereof on or before October 9, 2025. Any parties may file a reply to the post-hearing filings on or before November 17, 2025.

This message and any attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information, and are intended only for the individual or entity identified above as the addressee. If you are not the addressee, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, you are not authorized to read, copy, or distribute this message and any attachments, and we ask that you please delete this message and attachments (including all copies) and notify the sender. Delivery of this message and any attachments to any person other than the intended recipient(s) is not intended in any way to waive confidentiality or a privilege. All personal messages express views only of the individual sender, and may not be copied or distributed without this statement.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This E-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of this E-mail or any attachment is prohibited. If you have received this E-mail in error, please notify us immediately by returning it to the sender and delete this copy from your system.

Thank you.

ICE MILLER LLP

