

Attn: Honorable Rosemary Chiavetta
Secretary of the PUC
Public Utility Commission
P.O BOX 3265, Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

April 16, 2016

Famille S. Trust
(Complainant)

vs

C-2014-2440650

Duquesne light company
(Respondent)

Subject: Objection and clarification on your decision in the above matter.

Dear Honorable Secretary;

We are unpleasantly surprised by the commission decision on the above docketed matter for the following raisons.

- 1) Contrary to your commission belief as evidenced by many pages in the final decision: Famille S. Trust has an attorney who signed the documents filed on September 11, 2015 to whom the commission had sent its final decision while denying his existence [Exhibit 1]. Furthermore, the defendant counsel was served [exhibit 2] and was well aware of the filing by phone. Curiously, defendant attorney did not respond to plaintiff attorney [Exhibit 3] in spite of the certificate of mailing clarity and notice of appearance [Exhibit 4].
- 1) The initial decision was issued while both parties had already resolved the issue and was received on September 1, 2015 apparently without knowledge of the ongoing inspection by defendant Duquesne light company on Plaintiff property. The photographs and exhibits sent to you on September 11, 2015 were proofs that the Defendant Duquesne light attorneys and employees in one hand and Famille S. Trust and its attorneys on the other hand had coordinated the inspection to Famille S. Trust property on July 31, 2015 to solve the issue. Defendant Duquesne light counsel had already admitted that the Famille S. Trust Solar System is not connected to Defendant Duquesne light Power line and there is not cross wiring between floors in plaintiff property, but apparently withhold and failed to present results to PUC. Thus, rendering the defendant claims inappropriate and irrelevant. Plaintiff request the reopening of the above docketed file for fair and transparent proceeding since the substance of defendant claims on plaintiff property were inaccurate, inexistent, irrelevant and the decision were made under suspicions that plaintiff does not have an attorney and that the Solar system was connected to defendant service line which has been proven to be inaccurate.

RECEIVED

2016 APR 27 PM 1:08


PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

- 2) Defendant Duquesne light knowing the base of its claims has no technical ground never sent actual bill to plaintiff. It will be an abuse of Judicial system to allow plaintiff complaints to be dismissed while:
- a) Plaintiff had an attorney who negotiated with Duquesne light to solve the issue which was more technical than legal and plaintiff was proven to be right on its interpretation of the Solar system in its property.
 - b) Defendant Duquesne light cause the problems by its persistent misunderstanding of plaintiff solar system which is actually an "off grid" system as opposed to a grid system and the lights on the hallway are indeed powered by plaintiff solar system as shown on photographs and video clip sent to you on September 11, 2015.
 - c) Defendant after refusing to allow independent investigation to clarify the issue was allowed for the second time to investigate and now after finding its claims were all false is trying to convince the commission that the proofs sent to you should not count while it participated in the process. *If these proofs cannot count and are irrelevant, so what was the purpose of defendant Duquesne light company investigation on plaintiff property on July 31, 2015?*
 - d) Since defendant refused to allow independent investigation which could have demonstrated that its claims were irrelevant, Plaintiff took care to video tape and photograph the investigation while defendant workers were present at the scene in absence of a third party investigator as plaintiff requested. This should be sufficient to dismiss defendant claims for lack of substances and cause the commission either to reopen the case or close the issue without prejudice since the entire claims and decision were based on suspicions which the facts proved to be highly erroneous.
- 3) The fact that Defendant Duquesne light had arranged for the matter to be solved and then went on to prevent the facts not to be considered when it find the that Famille S. Trust solar System is an off grid as claimed by the plaintiff since the very beginning is sufficient to reconsider and review the case in light of evidences rather than suspicions since defendant claims on plaintiff property were entirely erroneous and inexistent.
- 4) The fact that the issue raised by defendant was erroneous and its claims were due to misinterpretation and misunderstanding of the plaintiff solar system arrangement should cause the commission to render defendant case invalid.
- 5) The fact that no actual bill was transferred and sent to plaintiff proves that defendant did not have any substantive facts to support its claims. Defendant is solely responsible for its misinterpretation and lack of understanding of the solar system in plaintiff property, which any knowledgeable technician would have been able to identify in less than 5 minutes. Therefore defendant claims should be dismissed entirely since its lacked substances and should not have been considered.

- 6) The entire investigation and decision process were based mainly on suspicions rather than facts that could have been very easy to verify. Furthermore, the defendant investigation on plaintiff property confirmed defendant erred that plaintiff solar system is a grid system which was the basis of the defendant erroneous claim to investigate plaintiff electrical system under Tariff rule.
- 7) Famille S. Trust had an attorney while arranging to solve the issue with defendant Duquesne light. The initial decision took place when the process of solving the issue was already completed. The investigation has proven to confirm plaintiff position that its solar system is an off grid and the lights in the hallway are powered by the solar system and present no danger to defendant power line. Thus the issue was solved and the commission should consider the facts as evidences. Defendant workers performed the inspection while plaintiffs tried to get videos and images and present them as evidence. Strangely enough defendant claims these evidences should not be considered since they contradict its claims.
- 8) In brief;
 - a) The issue claimed by the defendants on plaintiff property did not exist.
 - b) The defendant resolved the issue by confirming the plaintiff position on the existence of off grid system that powered the hallway lights.
 - c) Defendant after refusing independent investigations is trying to deny its own investigations since the evidences are clearly opposed to its claims. This was not an attempt to introduce new matter as alleged by defendant but a follow up of the arrangements agreed upon between parties in order to clarify the issue.
 - d) An attorney filed plaintiffs' documents contrary to claims by defendant repeated in many pages by the commission in its decision.
 - e) It is a criminal offense as apparently and implicitly suggested in many pages of the commission decision for anyone to use someone else identity or for someone to portray herself as an attorney using unauthorized signature and identification. The commission erred in speculating and implicitly accusing plaintiff for tampering of documents and misrepresentation as attorney.

Given all the facts stated above, plaintiff Famille S. Trust believed the commission should reconsider, review and reopen the above case since defendant claims were proven to be non existent and that the process of investigation and decision were riddle by suspicions rather than facts which has proven plaintiff claims to be accurate.

Sincerely yours;



For Famille S. Trust
Matundu Felix, *Eng. Ph. D*
C/o FST/BK,
510 South Ave (Main box), PA 15221



Commonwealth of PA
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Address Service Requested

OE

OF THE RETURN ADDRESS, FOLD AT DOTTED LINE
CERTIFIED MAIL™



9171 9690 0935 0117 2981 82


Master
04/17/2016
US POSTAGE \$006.27
ZIP 15215
01E1265040

RECEIVED
2016 APR 27 PM 1:08
PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

C-2014-2440650
GARY KALMEYER ESQ
COMPLAINANT
KALMEYER AND KALMEYER
410 RODI ROAD
PITTSBURGH, PA 15235

Exhibit 1

FIRST CLASS



RECEIVED

2016 APR 27 PM 1:08

PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU



Certificate Of Mailing

This Certificate of Mailing provides evidence that mail has been presented to USPS® for mailing. The form may be used for domestic and international mail.

From: GARY KALMEYER
KALMEYER AND KALMEYER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
410 RODI ROAD, PITTSBURGH
PA 15233

To: Jeremy Farrell
Tucker Arensberg 1500 PAG
PLACE, PITTSBURGH, PA 15222

PS Form 3817, April 2007 PSN 7530-02-000-9065

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PITTSBURGH, PA
15213
SEP 11, 15
AMOUNT
\$1.35
00111607-06



TUCKER ARENSBERG
Attorneys

1500 One PPG Place Pittsburgh, PA 15222

15221#2814 013

neopost[®]

09/28/2015

US POSTAGE

\$00.70⁵



ZIP 15222
041L11248082

Famille S. Trust and Lusala Simananga
510 South Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15221

RECEIVED

2016 APR 27 PM 1:09

**PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU**

Exhibit 3

COMMON WEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC
UTILITY COMMISSION

RECEIVED
2016 APR 27 PM 1:09
PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

In The matter of: Famille S. Trust and Lusala Simananga
Vs
Duquesne Light Company

Docket: C- 2014 -2440650


NOTICE OF APPEARANCE

Please enter my appearance in the above-designated matter on behalf of *complainant,*
Famille S. Trust and Lusalia Simananga
I am authorized to accept service on behalf of in this matter

[CHECK ONE]

On the basis of this notice, I request a copy of each document hereafter issued by
the commission in this matter.

I am already receiving or have access to copy of each documents issued by the
commission in this matter (alone , or in a consolidated proceeding) and not the basis of
this notice require an additional copy.



Signature
Gary Kalmeyer

Name (printed)
410 Rodi Road

P.O address
Pittsburgh PA 15235

City, State and Zip Code/Vania ID
412-371-6059


Telephone Number
(Including Area Code)
17021

Pennsylvania Attorney I.D. No./
Other Jurisdiction(s) Admitted

Electronic Mail Address (Optional)

Exhibit 4

Famille S. Trust
C/o FST / BK
510 South Ave (Main box)
Pittsburgh, PA 15221



U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PITTSBURGH, PA
15222
APR 25 16
AMOUNT

\$0.89

1000

17105

R2305M146483-22

Attn: Secretary of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Public Utility Commission
Bureau of Consumer Service.
P.O BOX 3265, Harrisburg,
PA 17105-3265

171053265 8099

