

October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016

Via Electronic Filing

Craig Jackson  
275 Frutchey Court  
Mount Bethel, PA 18343

Docket No: C-2016-2565262  
Craig Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Company  
Preliminary Objection of Met-Ed

Response to Met-Ed's Preliminary Objection

Met-Ed's Preliminary Objection erroneously restates my complaint as a property rights controversy which is remiss. My dispute doesn't infer a ROW controversy. The complaint addresses Met-Ed's predatory and discriminatory practice for enforcing its ROW. Met-Ed's Attorney doesn't present any case law referencing harassment or discriminatory practices. During the case hearing, I shall present a concise case depicting Met-Ed's harassment and discriminatory policy by the Forestation personnel. Pictures don't lie. These personnel should be terminated and replaced with capable and competent employees. The Public Utility Commission has jurisdiction for enforcing harassment, discriminatory or predatory practice by a utility company. In addition, the Public Utility has jurisdiction for ensuring public safety from the actions of the utilities due to Met-Ed spraying dangerous chemicals with run-off in my well water. The ROW agreement doesn't give Met-Ed authority to spray dangerous and harmful chemicals on the ROW next to my well.