

Feb 22, 2017

RE: F 2016 - 254 8959 Response and Request for waiver

On Feb 21, 2017, a letter was received regarding the above case. The letter was dated on January 5, 2017 - approximately a month and a half prior to the actual receipt of the said letter.

FEB 24 2017

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

I found this puzzling. Therefore, I inquired at the post office that processes the mail. Upon checking, he stated that there is a record of a certified letter that was returned to the PUC. This is also puzzling in that it does not make sense for a certified letter to be sent to a person that on numerous occasions has been described as an invalid who has no ability to hear or respond to a knock at the door by a postal worker. Furthermore, if a

notice was left it would have been impossible for an invalid who is both visually and hearing impaired to respond to it in a timely fashion.

In the initial decision, it was also stated that Ms Mitchell did not attend without notification.

Once again, this is puzzling. I have a copy of a certified letter that clearly stated the health limitations of Ms Mitchell. I had mentioned that a phone conference would not work due to the fact that she could barely hear and speech is limited. Furthermore, she is suffering from dementia. In that letter, I mentioned that I would ask an attorney for limited power of attorney to move this case forward and I

wanted further procedural instructions. That was a letter that I had sent on Oct 18, 2017. I sent a separate letter a day earlier regarding a continuation on an upcoming case hearing that was scheduled. I also mentioned the health compromises of Ms. Mitchell in that letter. The request for continuation was acknowledged. The letter regarding power of attorney has not been acknowledged. Both letters clearly stated the health issues that would make either an in-person or a phone hearing impossible. The post office verified that the certified letter dated Oct 18, 2017 was received.

Finally, an attorney has contacted PGW to discuss and possibly rectify the issues discussed. He was treated in a brusque, rude fashion - despite the fact that PGW had discussed the said issues with several parties prior to the attorney contact. The issues are quite simple -

(1) The validity of the amount transferred to Dolores Mitchell account. What is the source of this debt and is the amount correct

(2) Once a determination is made a reasonable payment plan can be determined

If you notice in their response, PGW does not address these issues. Instead, they compile a list of conversations that are not pertinent to the complaint. The issues are not difficult and probably could be resolved without a hearing. It is only PGW's combative, defensive approach that prevents this from occurring. Is it possible that they cannot justify the source and the amount of the transferred debt?

John Mitchell  
JreShane

2416 North 50th S  
Phila PA 19131



7015 1730 0002 2396 9971



1000



17120

U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
PHILADELPHIA, PA  
19107  
FEB 22, 17  
AMOUNT

**\$4.05**  
R2305K143066-11

Secretary,  
Pa. Public Utilities Commission  
400 North Street  
Commonwealth Keystone Building 2<sup>nd</sup> floor  
Harrisburg, PA ~~17120~~ 17120

