

Mary F. Kingcade
5538 Warrington Ave.
Philadelphia PA 19143
267-670-3845

ORIGINAL

October 28, 2011

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Secretary's Bureau
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

2011 OCT 31 AM 11:03

RECEIVED

RE: Mary F. Kingcade v. Philadelphia Gas Works

Docket No. E-2009-2134662
NO. E-2010-277-8854
NO. E-2011-224-4748

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Thank you for responding to my letter that was sent to the office of the Administrative Law Judge in Harrisburg PA.

Enclosed is an original letter with an original signature of the letter sent to the office of the Administrative Law Judge in Harrisburg.

Respectfully,
Mary F. Kingcade

MARY F. Kingcade
5538 Warrington Ave.
Philadelphia, PA 19143
267-670-3845

October 20, 2011

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Office of Administrative Law Judge
Secretary Bureau
PO BOX 3265
Harrisburg, PA. 17105-3265

RE: Mary F. Kingcade v. Philadelphia Gas Works

Docket No. C-2009-213-4662
NO. C-2010-277-8854

Dear your Honor:
Dear Sir/madam:

On August 04 2011 at the first hearing of the above caption
Complainant submitted a complaint with a cause of Action.
Defendent PGW had (20) twenty days to respond, object
or defend. Defendents did neither.

After not responding to the complaint presented on
August 04, 2011 by complainant, the Movant Complainant
Presented a legal Brief in support of her complaint with
A cause of Action September 26, 2011.

At the second Hearing on October 19, 2011 Defendent PGW
Submitted an allegedly "Brief" in the FORM of Exhibits.
This is Totally my Impression.

(2)

During that Hearing on October 19, 2011 Complainant objected to the Exhibits due to many discrepancies and disagreements noted in the Exhibits.

Complainant, however, subsequently agreed to the Submission of the (28) twenty pages of Exhibits. The Court is offering no continuing Hearing date for rebuttal.

Complainant feel that the actions of the defendants has been continuously not in good standards with the rules and laws of Pennsylvania. I feel the actions of the defendants should not be allowed.

The defendants PGW after allegedly violating the PA. one call system law and the underground utility line Protection Law Act 287 of 1974 as amended, has been given permission by the Court to take (30) thirty days to gather evidence to justify the defendants violation of PA. one call system law and the utility underground utility line law. This action prolongs my case into the winter months. Complainant needs her Gas service restored for heating purposes.

Complainant has been deprived of heating service from PGW for (2) two years due to nonscheduling of a Hearing date by the PUC. I never received any notification or correspondence from PUC with a reason to why or what the reason for not scheduling a hearing for Complainant case for (2) years.

(3)

The consumer is told "When you have a problem file a complaint". Complainant filed a complaint (2) two years ago and has gotten no results.

The fight appears to be not in restoring my Gas service but to defend not taking responsibility for all the errors that has been made within the course of my complaints. Complainant is pleading for consideration to the dire need to have her Gas Service restored.


cc: James McNulty, Secretary
Administrative Law
Judge Eranda Vero
PGW
Laureto Farinas, Esq.

Respectfully,
Mary F. Kingcade
Mary F. Kingcade

Mary Kingsade
5538 Warrington Ave
Philadelphia PA 19143

PHILADELPHIA PA 191

25 OCT 1984 PM 2 T



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY Commission
ATT- Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
P.O. BOX 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265