

September 20, 2013

Via Electronic Filing

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street-Second Floor
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Docket #2013-2371560

LIDIA SHAN
V
VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA, INC

LETTER TO AN ASSIGNED ALJ

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.

Dear Ms. Chiavetta,

Attached for filing is my **LETTER TO AN ASSIGNED ALJ for the Hearing scheduled on September 27, 2013** with the Commission in connection with complaint Docket #2013-2371560.

My LETTER will be served to your office and the opponent at the same time as required by the Commission's Regulations by the date above. This is to verify that I E-filed my "Petition" and Certificate of Service to your attention and to the opponent.

Thank you very much for your attention into the above matter.

Respectfully,

Lidia Shan,
301 Byberry Rd, Apt. #F-14,
Philadelphia, PA 19116
215-677-6471
smellsense@aol.com

cc: Steven K. Haas,
Counsel for Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
Hawke McKeon & Sniscak, LLP
100 North Tenth Street,
Harrisburg, PA 17105-1778

VIA E-FILING

September 20, 2013

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Docket #2013-2371560

**Lidia Shan
v
Verizon Pennsylvania, Inc.**

LETTER TO AN ASSIGNED ALJ

Your Honor,

The reason for me to petition an assignment of an impartial ALJ was that in the Christopher Pell's opinion he could separate parts from the case as a different matter disregarding the premise of my complaint to suit Verizon; ALJ failed to understand the scope of Verizon's problems created by them and described in my complaint, stating that

ALJ has no interest to hear the premise of the complaint; ALJ failed to subpoena the requested documents from PPUC and Verizon advising me to obtain all necessary documents on my own; ALJ knowingly advised me to do what in reality cannot be obtained unless a Motion or an Order is issued by a judge or ALJ. PPUC and Verizon intentionally refused to provide the requested documents in order for me to have a fair hearing.

I requested from PPUC to provide "Operational procedure to suspend a telephone line and associated costs." ALJ advised me that PPUC doesn't possess this particular document. The question is: if PPUC doesn't possess this procedure how could PPUC approve a tariff for suspended telephone without having a real procedure from Verizon? I need to have an answer to this question.

I perfectly understood the strategy used by Verizon and PPUC and that is to avoid the direct response to a particular issue I raised enabling them to choose and pick something else non-essential, unimportant and spin instead of answering directly to the issue. OSA nor ALJ did not stop this manipulation and did not request Verizon to obey the Utility Code.

Cynthia Fordham knowingly disregarded the issues of my complaint by allowing Verizon to spin on something unimportant and that was instead of clarifying the issues of costs and operational procedure for suspended line she changed this topic to the billing dispute between Verizon and me. She cut out all important arguments and questions of the complaint by concealing them from the evidence and accepted P.O. of Verizon as a valid document, made belief that the letter to Secretary McNulty written eight months prior to the hearing was suddenly a late exhibit and later threw this document out as non-existent for evidence, disregarded important evidence in the court hearing the testimony of Verizon's representative Ms. Ryan by not admitting that statement as evidence and existence and

signed the I.D. assuming that it will not be discovered by an ordinary consumer. Based on this fraudulent misconduct, the Commission made their decision allowing Verizon to continue their deceitful practices.

By evaluating these facts I objected to have a court hearing when ALJ will choose and pick what ALJ would like to hear to benefit Verizon. It will not happen again. Without hearing all of the complaint at once and requested documents from Verizon and PPUC be released for the hearing there should not be a hearing until all my requests are met. My complaint cannot be divided into meaningless parts. It is one large complaint concerning Verizon's illegal tariff for suspended lines and other irregularities in the system of verifications of confirmation numbers issued by Verizon. It concerns one company and their inappropriate practices but it concerns millions of Pennsylvanians who want to put their phone on suspension.

It is not my fault that PPUC avoids the responsibility to provide a credible, impartial ALJ. Consumer cannot be a victim of Verizon's illegal practices. PPUC continue to kick can down the road without resolution and appropriate regulation.

My reclamation written to Chairman Powelson that is attached to the above docket describes all the irregularities of previously processed complaint that was not resolved allowing Verizon continuation of defrauding the consumers of Pennsylvania.

In my discovery on September 18, 2013 in the discussion with Verizon's representative who identified that the documents I requested over a month ago are indeed in existence in Verizon's system. There are notes attached to my account in Verizon's system as of September 18, 2013 where there is a statement that the conversation took place on November 21, 2011 and it was issued with a flat fee of \$6.0 per month for suspended line.

I requested to release records of the conversation of November 21, 2011 regarding suspension of services for my telephone. It is obvious that the denial of records existence that would correlate to the confirmation number is a lie. Verizon's "Objections" and "Answer" reveals openly these lies in officially responding to my requests. Therefore, on September 19, 2013 I Motion to dismiss from evidence these Verizon's correspondences and requested Verizon again to release the documents they possess.

Verizon perfectly understood what I was requesting from them and that was to identify the confirmation numbers I received from Verizon and correlate with the content of the conversation on particular dates and yet Verizon goes to the extent to lie. I noted in previous correspondences that Verizon lied avoiding to respond to questionable strategies they practice. Legal advisors, OSA, ALJ and Commission accepted Verizon's lies as legitimate document. Furthermore, Commission based their decision on lies fabricated by Verizon. Apparently PPUC' Utility Codes allow these shameful irregularities.

ALJ Christopher Pell stated that he will not be interested in hearing what other ALJ miserably mishandled. It was a responsibility of OSA and Commission to oversee what was illegal and Order Verizon to obey Utility Codes by overturning everything fabricated by Verizon's I.D. signed by ALJ Cynthia Fordham and D. Buckley. Apparently in PPUC' and Verizon's minds these discrepancies will not ever be discovered. Unfortunately the complaint was never given a proper attention and it continues to be unresolved. This is the reason why all of the complaint must be heard at once.

The request of August 7, 2013 from Secretary Chiavetta for (recordings) or transcript of the hearing of September 23, 2010 and OSA's comments and recommendations to Commission are still missing from my exhibits in order for ALJ to comprehend the full scope of my complaint. It seems

that Secretary Chiavetta is not expediting what I requested over a month ago. I was told that I will receive an answer within thirty days. These documents must be requested by ALJ as they are important to identify the basis for Commission's decision in the case.

The following documents I requested from Verizon but they refuse to release them.

I insist that ALJ subpoena Verizon to provide this documentation:

1. Operational procedure to disconnect the dial tone line and associated costs;
2. Operational procedure to suspend the dial tone line and associated costs;
3. Operational procedure to issue a confirmation number;
4. Records, notes of conversation between Verizon representative and me on November 21, 2011;
5. Records, notes of conversation between Verizon representative and me on November 2, 2010;
6. Confirmation number PA 00128314172 of 21/11/2011 and what it concerns;
7. Confirmation number PA00077679813 of 2/11/2010 and what it concerns;
8. Where these confirmation numbers are being logged and stored?
9. What is the value of the confirmation number?
10. What is the validity of confirmation number?
11. How long the confirmation numbers must be kept for references?
12. Is there an established tracking system to reference the confirmation numbers?
13. Who reads and has access to oversee the confirmation numbers?
14. How these confirmation numbers are being coordinated with billing department and correlated to the account of the consumer?

Just because the docket number is closed doesn't constitute that the issues of my complaints were fully resolved. No, they were not resolved and until they will be resolved I'll continue filing complaints.

It doesn't matter how ALJ interpreted my complaint the issue of resolving the tariff for suspended lines remains open for consideration and it will be a responsibility of assigned ALJ to hear and make a proper decision. Verizon misled PPUC in obtaining the approval of the tariff for suspended lines by concealing the fact that the suspended line in reality is a disconnected line without a signal or dial tone. This argument conveniently was omitted from the I.D. of ALJ in the docket #2009-2150021 that caused other two complaints to be filed. PPUC and Verizon cannot run away without fully reconsidering the matter of my complaint. The case built in conspiracy between ALJ Cynthia Fordham, D. Buckley and Verizon legal team had too many holes in their strategy of how to close the complaint without resolution and make the complainant to go away.

Christopher Pell displayed intentional willingness to dismiss my complaint also without discovery, investigation, resolution and proper understanding the scope of problems Verizon created. ALJ decided to do what Cynthia Fordham and D. Buckley did by not properly addressing the issues of my complaints passing through the channels without resolution. ALJ decided to play Verizon's hand and separated the docket #2013-2371560 from the other dockets even though the other dockets are the result of unresolved issues of 2009 complaint and attached to this docket reclamation describing the intentional mishandling of the complaint.

Focusing on one part only of the complaint and eliminating the other factors of greater importance that basically caused this complaint to be filed, not subpoena the requested necessary documents from Verizon and PPUC made me to

believe that ALJ was not interested to end Verizon defrauding the consumers by their manipulative practices.

The subject matter in my complaint is blanked out by Verizon in the "Answer" and ALJ failed to oversee this discrepancy accepting it as a valid response to my complaint. This conduct makes me to believe that ALJ is not impartial judge to make a difference in resolving the argument.

In my petition I did not request to postpone the hearing but I warned Verizon that they will be liable for postponement of the hearing by not providing the documents I requested in timely manner.

"The disqualification of presiding officer" is not my responsibility but it is my objection to have a presiding officer, an ALJ who failed fully to understand what supposed to be his responsibility to oversee and conduct accordingly. It is clear that PPUC is continue stonewalling my demands to resurrect ability for the consumers to question the procedures of PPUC and bring to light their deceitful practices against the consumers. Are you aware of the existence of over ninety correspondences between PPUC and me? Have you read them? None of them were accepted for consideration, none of them were granted permission to prove the facts, none of them were directly answered by Verizon or PPUC and yet ALJ did not Order Verizon to respond to unanswered questions placed in all these correspondences. Correspondences were all conveniently and intentionally ignored. What this conduct supposed to constitute? It constitutes that PPUC and Verizon are definitely hiding from the consumers the truth about suspended land lines. Verizon and PPUC are in conspiracy against the consumers; they knowingly omitted from every correspondence initiated by Verizon and PPUC that the suspended line is a disconnected line and it doesn't have a signal; it doesn't have a dial tone or touch tone nor voice

service. Verizon is not interested to satisfy my demands because they will have to reveal their secrets that they have no case but intentional revenge in filing with collection agencies against me jeopardizing my credit reputation. This conduct constitutes obstruction of justice.

By closing my complaints without resolution constitutes deceit and promotes fraud. It is obvious because the fraud is continuing even from the time I began questioning PPUC and Verizon. In actuality the fraud began after 1997. Verizon and PPUC did not argue that my complaints were non-essential in questioning Verizon's or PPUC' deceitful practices, they underestimated abilities of an ordinary consumer to investigate the process of judicial conduct and qualifications of assigned ALJ, the deceitfully approved tariff for suspended lines. Verizon and PPUC run away from responsibilities by closing, dismissing, not accepting, objecting or ignoring the issues by not facing the problems they created. What it does constitute is the intentional failure to protect the consumers from Verizon's unsubstantiated demands.

Assigned ALJ Christopher Pell was following the suit of other ALJ assigned to my complaints. Therefore I petitioned to assign an impartial judge. Comparing the conduct of three ALJ I come to the conclusion that apparently the instructions ALJ received from Verizon who pays their wages is: deny any rights of the consumer to question Verizon's and PPUC' deceitful practices by silencing them, by dismissing any consumer arguments who question Verizon immoral code of business ethics. ALJ abusing their power following the instructions of Verizon knowingly obstructing justice, stonewalling the consumers because Verizon's secret information must be hidden from millions of consumers.

Have you ever investigated the content of docket #2011-2243183? ALJ D. Buckley signed what Verizon fabricated for him without questioning Verizon's P.O. and New Matter of operational procedure to issue a confirmation number, its

value and validity blanking out in entirety main point concerning issuance of confirmation number closed preliminary the docket #2011-2243183 causing docket #2013-2371560 to be filed due to the intentional unwillingness or incompetence of ALJ. Christopher Pell's conduct is no different from the ALJ D. Buckley or Cynthia Fordham.

ALJ stated that I did not respond to Verizon's "Motion to dismiss." It is incorrect. I did respond to the "Motion to dismiss" on August 20, 2013 under "Notification of Disagreement of Satisfaction." Have you had a chance to acknowledge my statement in this Notification? Verizon again knowingly concealed the facts that their system in record keeping was not developed yet. My response to Verizon's "Answer" became a New Matter after I discovered that Verizon does have records of the conversations between Verizon and me on particular dates. It is a New Matter because Verizon is involved in openly lying in the official documents.

Regardless of the name of my written statement in response to Verizon's "Answer" and your Order to dismiss the statement under the name "New Matter" , ALJ left the complaint unanswered by Verizon because I rejected in entirety the "Answer" as the content of it did not respond to the issues of my complaint. It makes no difference if you close the complaint in entirety it will not change the equation: Verizon's approved by Commission tariffs for suspended lines remains illegal and Verizon together with PPUC knowingly concealed this information from the consumers for years allowing fraud.

By hiding the requested documents of the conversations on particular dates is proving that Verizon is lying that I am delinquent. Verizon must to clear my credit records from delinquency immediately and recall their falsified files from collection agencies as unsubstantiated.

For your information attached below is the full document I e-filed on August 20, 2013.

August 20, 2013

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street — Filing Room (2nd Floor)
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

RE: Lidia Shan
v
Verizon Pennsylvania;

Docket No. C-2013-2371560

**NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT OF SATISFACTION
OF A SUBJECT MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission is my **Notification for Disagreement of Satisfaction** of a subject matter by the respondent in the complaint Docket # 2013-2371560. A copy of this document will be served to your office and the respondent at the same time as required by the Commission's Regulations by the date above. This is to verify that I E-filed my Notification of Disagreement of Satisfaction to a subject matter and Certificate of Service to your attention and to the respondent.

If you have any questions with regard to this filing, please direct them to me. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Lidia Shan
215-758-0280

cc: Steven K. Haas,
Counsel for Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.
Hawke McKeon & Sniscak, LLP
100 North Tenth Street,
Harrisburg, PA 17101

August 20, 2013

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street — Filing Room (2nd Floor)
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

LIDIA SHAN,
V

Docket No. C-2013-2371560

VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA LLC,

NOTIFICATION OF DISAGREEMENT OF SATISFACTION OF A SUBJECT MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT

I am notifying PPUC that for over four years I have not received from Verizon a satisfaction to the subject matter I raised in my complaints.

Under the provision of the "Fifth Amendment Rights" I have rights to express my point of view when I disagree with the due process I experienced and did not receive a clear response to the subject matter from the respondent. I am dissatisfied with inaction of PPUC. I have rights to be heard by PPUC Commissioners, I have rights to express my disagreements with Verizon's practices and my documentations will be presented to the Commissioners and will not be suppressed by Verizon; however, I am being deprived of this experience.

I acknowledge the bravados of different the utility codes Verizon is threatening me with. These codes were not written for the consumers to use or question particular irregularities of the utility they practice; they were written by Verizon, for Verizon and violated by Verizon and cannot pertain to the consumers needs nor can be overturned due to inefficiencies of the code. I have rights to speak out and Verizon has no rights to silence me until Verizon will take into consideration the existence of the recorded conversation that will substantiate my proof that I do not owe Verizon any payments. For years dealing with Verizon's correspondences I experienced that Verizon never will admit to a wrong doing and always intentionally will omit the essentials of the subject matter by expressing unimportant issues not pertaining to its merit. So, "Motion to Strike" is another example of how Verizon is manipulating the evidence by blanking it out as non-existent. It should be noted first by Verizon that complaint docket #2013-2371560 expresses different experience I encountered by asking Verizon to provide for me suspended line for the time when I am not using the phone. All the conversations are being recorded by Verizon between the consumer and Verizon's representative. It is documented and readily available for listening. This is a new matter as it is not related to the previous correspondences and must be treated as a new matter regardless whether Verizon recognized it or not. Besides, it really doesn't matter what is the name of a response of the complainant when the answer of the respondent to the complaint is knowingly avoiding the subject matter and therefore is not satisfying issues of my complaint. Due to the fact that Verizon intentionally avoided responding in "Answer" to the subject matter therefore it becomes a New Matter and I have rights to name it as I believe it will bring the

attention of those who supposed to oversee the activities described in utility codes.

Based on the aforementioned, I refuse to recognize the "Answer" or the "Motion to Strike" as these documents do not address the subject matter and that is that Verizon must listen to their own recordings of November 21, 2011 that took place between Verizon's customer service and me where the confirmation number (Order) was issued and flat fee was established for the suspended line for nine months I requested at the time of this conversation. Based on this document I do not owe Verizon any additional payments and therefore Verizon must clear my account from any overdue payments and allow my telephone to be connected to the land line I have with the number 215-677-6471. Verizon must cancel their demands for outstanding balance of \$70.20 and close the files with two separate collection agencies. I disagree with Verizon's demands as they do not sustain the proof that I owe Verizon any extra payments according to the confirmation number issued to me on November 21, 2011. I request ALJ not to consider this complaint until Verizon provides the recordings of November 21, 2011.

I request that this recording be send to my home address for verification and recognition.

I request a hearing in this New Matter due to the fact that Verizon violated my rights and refuses to provide for me a telephone line at my residence. It is imperative to take into consideration that in Philadelphia we do not have any other option for a land line besides Verizon. We need a telephone in case of a health emergency but we are being deprived.

Respectfully submitted,

Lidia Shan
215-758-0280