

June 8, 2012.

PLC case - 7-2012-2294-555

Nehemiah B. Thomas
1453 So. Colorado St.
Phila. Pa. 19146

Hi! I had asked the PLC to send copies of my case to the proper people, but I guess I didn't say print. I have been attacked again by the terrorist. I made a police report to the 17th District (6-6-12, office. There was no copy of the exceptions enclosed, like your letter said. I have made 10 (ten) copies at Kinko's. I guess this is what you want.

Thank You
Nehemiah B. Thomas

RECEIVED
JUN 8 2012
PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

May 26, 2012

Nehemiah B. Thomas

①

I also used in evidence a J.C. Penney Ad that states a 1500 watt heater, that cost pennies an hour. I also brought a 1500 watt heater for \$216.00 that states it will run for pennies a day. I offered in my appeal to let the PUC test it in my home, and the next day my wires were cut. I am also charged that someone tried to get around my evidence and appeal in the first case. I believe because I was communicating through fax, and told the Judge of the terrorism I was experiencing, my wires were cut, just as this time my generator cord just happened to break.

Thank You
Nehemiah B. Thomas

RECEIVED

P.S. Please refer to all evidence that I have sent in. My Life is in Danger. I also have called in stating my desire of appeal. Peco gave me a list of service underwriters to check the safety of my service

May 25, 2012

Public Utility Commission

F-2012-2294
555

Nehemiah B. Thomas
1453 So. Colorado St.
Phila. Pa. 19146
215-462-1567

Hi! I would like to say that I disagree with this decision of above stated case. The Community Legal Service advised me to let you know of my difficulty, and I have. This time my generator broke down. It seems to be just at the time of a Court Case. Therefore I would like to ask the Court to serve all parties, of the fact that I want to APPEAL this decision to the next level Court. It was said that I would use the same evidence as in the previous case of which I APPEALED also. In this the particulars are different, but still defending the basic points.

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
RECEIVED PUC BUREAU

JUN 8 2012

This Case - 7-2012-2294-555
Hazard Tag - which was not put up by Mr. Ariavola, as Mr. Roscovitch testified, and was taken down by Peco 10/21/2010, however, it was the reason my service was shut off, and never was a part of the case, originally.

(over)

The other part of the case was about five (5) consecutive months of overcharge - from Feb. 2011 to ~~March~~ June 2011 for over ^{or} around \$1500.00. While the first case was in court,

Now the similarities of the last case are, and this may have not been made clear to Administrative Law Judge Junderdale, in that the Service Entrance wire was in dispute of the fact ~~was~~ ^{that} the Server or the customer ^{was} responsible for repair. The hazard tag was on the electrical cable and grounded by a separate wire. But the hazard tag was put up in Dec. 2006, and not ~~to~~ in Dec. 2007. The ground wire stopped the hazard perspective as to electricity escape ~~ing~~. It was not grounded when the wires were cut in Dec. 2006. And Peco cut the tag in Oct. 2010, therefore the hazard must have gone. As you can see the Service Cable is involved but not as to whose responsible for repair.

(Next Page)

Now the other similarity is in the fact that the second case dealing with overcharges, as the first case did. However for different time periods as stated in both cases. The general similarity is founded in Peco representatives saying that a 1500 watt appliance burns 1500 watts every hour. As opposed to relating to average usage according to different appliances. As is the fact that computers, calculators etc. burn millions of times less ^(microamperes) than energy per amp. Thus defining that the cost is represented by how much energy is pulled, calculated in amps but counted in watts. (World Book Encyclopedia) Judge Nguyen agreed that the evidence about all outside wires are the responsibility of the Server, but deemed it ^{is true} basically confussing. I believe I can clarify it.

(over)

May 27, 2012

Nehemiah B. Thomas

②

I also used in evidence a JC Penney Ad that states a 1500 watt heater, that cost pennies an hour. I also brought a 1500 watt heater for \$216.00 that states it will run for pennies a day. I offered in my appeal to let the PUC test it in my home, and the next day my wires were cut. I am also charged that someone tried to get around my evidence and appeal in the first case. I believe because I was communicating through fax, and told the Judge of the terrorism I was experiencing, my wires were cut, just as this time my generator cord, just happened to break.

Thank You
Nehemiah B. Thomas

P.S. Please refer to all evidence that I have sent in. My Life is in Danger. I also have called in stating my desire of appeal. Peco gave me a list of service underwriters to check the safety of my service

May 25, 2012

RECEIVED

Public Utility Commission

F-2012-2294
555

Nehemiah B. Thomas
1453 So. Colorado
Phila. Pa. 19146
215-467-1567

Hi! I would like to say that I disagree with this decision of above stated case. The Community Legal Service advised me to let you know of my difficulty, and I have. This time my generator broke down. It seems to be just at the time of a Court Case. Therefore I would like to ask the Court to serve all parties of the fact that I want to APPEAL this decision to the next level Court. It was said that I would use the same evidence as in the previous case of which I APPEALED also. In this the particulars are different, but still defending basic points.

Case # 7-2012-2294-555

Zard Tag - which was not put up by Mr. Briavola, as Mr. Roscovitch notified, and was taken down by Peco 10/21/2010, however, it was the reason my service was shut off, and never was a part of the case, originally.

(over)

JUN 8 2012

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

2012 Nehemiah S. Thomas 11/29/2012 Nehemiah S. Thomas
The other part of the case was about five (5) consecutive months of overcharge - from Feb. 2011 to March June 2011 for over ^{or} around \$1500.00. While the first case was in Court.

Now the similarities of the last case are, and this may have not been made clear to Administrative Law Judge Junderdale, in that the Service Entrance wire was in dispute of the fact ~~was~~ ^{that} the Server or the customer ^{was} responsible for repair. The hazard tag was on the electrical cable and grounded by a separate wire. But the hazard tag was put up in Dec. 2006, and not ~~to~~ in Dec. 2007. The ground wire stopped the hazard perspective as to electricity escape ~~ing~~. It was not grounded when the wires were cut in Dec. 2006. And Peco cut the tag in Oct. 2010, therefore the hazard must have gone. As you can see the Service Cable is involved but not as to whose responsible for repair.

(Next Page)

Now the other similarity is in the fact that the second case dealing with overcharges, as the first case did. However for different time periods as stated in both cases. The general similarity is founded in Peco representatives saying that a 1500 watt appliance burns 1500 watts every hour. As opposed to relating to average usage according to different appliances. As is the fact that computers, calculators etc. burn millions of times less ^(microamperes) than energy per amp. Thus defining that the cost is represented by how much energy is pulled, calculated in amps but counted in watts. (World Book Encyclopedia). Judge Nguyen agreed that the evidence about all outside wires are the responsibility of the Server, but deemed it ^{is true} basically confusing. I believe I can clarify it.

(over)



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

JUN 1 1 2012

Flat Rate Mailing Envelope

Visit us at usps.com

United States Postal Service®

DELIVERY CONFIRMATION™



0312 0090 0000 5163 1302



PS00001000014

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE



PHILADELPHIA, PA 19130 JUN 08 '12 AMUUN1 \$5.90 00059130-09

PLEASE PRESS FIRI

1006

17105



For Domestic and International Use



JUN 1 1 2012

From Nehemiah B. Thomas
1453 So. Colorado St.
Phila, Pa 19146

TO PLLC, Sec of the Commission
2nd floor, Keystone Building
400 North St. Harrisburg Pa.
P.O. Box 3265 Harrisburg Pa, 17105-3265

Label 228, January 2008