

April, 16, 2013

Via e-filing

Rosemary Chiavetta
Secretary, PA PUC,
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, Filing Room, 2-nd floor
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

LIDIA SHAN –

V

VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA, INC

Docket # 2009-2150021

Dear Secretary Chiavetta,

I am in receipt of April 1, 2013 Verizon, PA, LLC an illusional "answer" to my Petition for Rescission.

I refuse to accept this illusion as a valuable answer; there is no argument or proof from Verizon that the questions of my complaint and the reasons for petition to rescind were unreasonable and the complaint was properly considered and satisfied. Therefore Verizon's response must be dismissed. All previous correspondences from Verizon for the Docket #2009-2150021 must be annuled as illegitimate because they are missing the argument to the premise of my complaint. It is inconceivable to read for all these years the same fabricated, unrelated to the issue responses from Verizon's counsel. It is an irresponsible deliberate act to neglect what should be a moral obligation of PPUC to resolve the important issues addressed in my formal complaint. It costs consumers millions of dollars of unjustifiable fees Verizon pockets when they bill the consumers while PPUC is writing their unreasonable Utility Codes without morality in them.

I request the Office of Special Assistants to fully evaluate the premise of my formal complaint, my letter to Mr. McNulty of January 25, 2010, my arguments in hearing, exceptions to ID, the comments and prepare recommendations for Commission consideration so that this matter can be conclusively decided.

From 2009 until 2013 Verizon was unwilling to address the questions of my formal complaint and was responding with unrelated matters in all their correspondences.

Office of Special Assistants for unknown reasons were not interested to identify that responses from Verizon were not addressing my complaint but rather were intentionally not discovered and nobody from your Office was able to stop troves of wasted paper and time instead of asking Verizon to answer questions and prepare proper recommendations for Commission. Is this the procedure of your Office to make an easy mockery of the complainant and close complaints for no evidence or like in my case unproven burden without resolution? Any refusal to recognize reality, for any reason, has disastrous consequences. There are no evil thoughts except one: the refusal to think. Verizon together with PPUC managed not to respond to my complaint, to my arguments in hearing of September 23, 2010, subsequent correspondence and even now, after repeating myself so many times, Verizon again mailed to your attention something unrelated and your office accepted five pages of absurd for consideration where there is not one word addressing my questions. I request that this activity of your Office to accept from Verizon anything they write if not related to the questions must be stopped and your Office must request Verizon to reply.

Under what Utility Code were you accepting Verizon's farced responses without them addressing the questions of my complaint? Do PPUC Utility Codes have moral values in their content or do they only write provisions for looters? Does PPUC have a social responsibility to conduct their business within a moral code?

In the course of the hearing I satisfied my burden of proof by questioning Ms. Ryan of Verizon of the operational procedure to disconnect the wire land line for suspension. Ms. Ryan in given testimony proved my point of the complaint that there is no incoming

signal when the phone is disconnected or suspended. She stated that when the phone is in suspension the circuit board is switched off on particular line and there is no signal; there is no touch tone, dial tone, and voice service, however, Verizon is billing for these non-existing services plus imposes taxes on non-existing services that are later being written off to become pure profit for Verizon. That was the premise of my formal complaint.

When a court is not bound by any rules, it is not bound by any facts, and then a hearing is not an issue of justice but an issue of men, and your fate depends not on what you have or not have done, but on whom you do or do not know. I asked myself a question: What chance could I have at such a hearing against PPUC, Verizon and their powerful friends? PPUC justice is to consist of upholding the unjustifiable. Humanity's darkest evil, the most destructive horror machine among all the devices of men, is non-objective law. This is the reason why the ID of ALJ was ludicrous.

Over 20 years ago PPUC decided that "commission does not fix or prescribe the rates, tolls, charges, rate structures, rate base" and Verizon petitioned PPUC in 2011 to allow them not to revise their tariffs, meaning that PPUC opened a flood gate of Wild West style robbery allowing Verizon to loot the consumers of Commonwealth in the daylight.

Is PPUC a public institution supported by public funds? On what grounds did PPUC base their decision to assure Verizon of specific profit making by providing for them Rate of Return Regulation off the backs of the consumers? In whose name you made a promise to loot? Not in our names can you continue to promise Verizon an exorbitant rate of return; they must compete. How long must this "promise/mortgage" in our bills last? Is it a life time "promise/mortgage" obligation for consumers to pay for highly inflexible services Verizon provides today with unreasonable charges? Why are the consumers forced to subsidize Verizon in Pennsylvania?

PPUC' Alternative Form of Regulation is the despicable, preposterous evil being spoken in a tone of "moral" righteousness. It is PPUC social

responsibility to amend the Alternative Form of Regulation now and not later! Now, not later! The code of the looters must collapse! When robbery is done in open daylight by sanctions of the law, as it is done in PPUC' Alternative Form of Regulation, then any act of honor or restitution has to be hidden underground.

Money is made possible only by the men who produce. Money is the material shape of the principle that men who wish to deal with one another must deal by exchanging value for value but not by looting and taking money from the men by force.

As a fact, Verizon forces me to pay for services they did not provide in 2012 for my suspended telephone line by filing a claim with collection agency. I do not owe Verizon a penny because their representative at the time of the request for suspension gave me a flat fee rate with the confirmation number that assured me of that particular fee. I paid that fee until I requested to put my phone into operation.

How far can Verizon's greed go if PPUC will not amend Alternative Form of Regulation and stop Verizon from looting? The pursuit of Verizon's wealth is greed, the root of all evil. Verizon is a company that claims that wealth is a matter of seizing someone's material property without exchanging for the equivalent value.

If a man has ever stolen a dime, you impose on him the punishment intended for a bank robber but PPUC gave Verizon the open window to rob without imposing on them the punishment but by rewarding and covering their fraudulent activities with Alternative Form of Regulation of Chapter 30.

It is a policeman's duty to retrieve stolen property and return it to its owners. But when robbery becomes the purpose of the law, and the policeman's duty becomes, not the protection, but the plunder of property - then it is an outlaw who has to become a policeman. What is the function of PPUC?

Chapter 30 states: "The Commission has an authority to reject or modify any such services to the extent the Commission finds that the service is not in compliance with any such provision." If this is the

responsibility of PPUC then why your organization doesn't do what you describe in Chapter 30 and reject, modify or eliminate what is not in existence and that is tariff for telephones in suspension? Verizon's tariff for suspended telephone lines is an illusion and the non-existing service is not in compliance with any provisions of Chapter 30.

Chapter 30 doesn't have a provision that will not allow PPUC to eliminate tariff that is not in compliance. Verizon is forcing the consumers to pay for suspended line without providing a signal on line. Verizon claims that regardless whether they provide the signal or not the consumer must to pay as if the phone is in operation. This claim of illusion is not in compliance with any of Chapter 30 provisions.

Provisions of Chapter 30 were a grave travesty to the consumers and must be amended.

That was the premise of my complaint; it was never addressed nor resolved.

PPUC conveniently made Verizon a monopoly. PPUC has withdrawn Verizon from the competition in Philadelphia and other counties and left all opportunities open for Verizon to do whatever they want including unreasonable charges. It is obvious that Verizon is not in compliance with the provision of Chapter 30 as they do not provide competitive services in Philadelphia.

Capitalism is built on the premise of competition not on looting.

Why the other states made provisions for Verizon not to allow them to charge for suspension lines any fees (Florida) or allow charges of a minimal flat fee in states where they have competition. A competitor of Verizon in Pennsylvania, not in Philadelphia, charges no fees for suspended lines. Why PPUC does not follow the practice of other states?

Since my formal complaint was gravely mishandled and had not received proper attention and resolution I request Verizon's "answer" of April 1, 2013 not to be admitted as a legitimate argument and therefore must be dismissed.

I request a new hearing be scheduled.

Lidia Shan
215-758-0280 (5 hours ahead of EST)
smellsense@aol.com

P.S. Please provide for me responses via e-mail as at the present time I am out of country and your mail may not be delivered or might be lost.