

Re: Claim # C 2017'2615852  
Reply to preliminary objections

RECEIVED

AUG 19 2017

To Whom It May Concern,

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

I am writing in regard to the "form letter" PECO response. My name is *not* Ryan Ingham. If there is a legal version of HIIPA (medical privacy) you are in violation by leaving his name on a portion of the response addressed to me (see page 2 of the Notice To Plead). (Nor is it Mr. Starr)

I am not, and do not have an attorney so my response below is in plain English. My hope being the court and board(s) involved in this mess consider themselves citizen rather than subject.

The importance here is proper implementation - judgement. A judge is one who dispenses justice. In the end, the citizens' treatment is paramount. Whereas a utility co. has an army of lawyers, the point of an oversight entity is to protect the private citizen from over reach. I stand on the Legislative journals that disprove the contention of PECO that the meters are intended to be mandatory. This only comes to pass if you ignore precedent set by these journals in favor of a large company strong-arming with the backing of people such as Rep. Godshall. His public statements are well known to those of us who care enough to stand up for what's right. The bottom line shouldn't be whether I can write 10 pages of legal-ease, or some technicality that "allows" one to dismiss me completely. The bottom line is that you are tasked with acting morally and this is what must be first and foremost.

Precisely what's at issue IS the disagreement of fact regarding the Legislature's intentions. Therefore, the points in PECO's preliminary objection #14, 13, 12 and 6 should be repudiated by the Justice.

I'm not sure if I'm reading numbers 10 and 11 correctly but it seems to read that what PECO says is automatically taken as fact and anything I write can be demeaned and disregarded. There seems to be a lot of case precedents listed. Since when do we follow like lemmings what another Justice determined? The law, and most importantly, the Spirit of the law is to be what's judged in each case - by its own merit.

Speaking to number 6 there is abundant legal sufficiency given the hardships, cruelty and danger to health "the Public" of which I am one have been subjected to. And the comments and actions (or inactions) of a person whose charge is to represent the citizen being the one who causes harm not allowing the legislature to correct the misrepresentation by the utility co. is in itself cause.

 8/19/17


Ruth Lattanzi, private citizen

**CERTIFIED MAIL**



**Judicial Watch**  
Because we care  
to share the law


Ms. Ruth Lattanzi  
123 E. Welsh Rd.  
Ambler, PA 19002



7016 3560 0000 5223 6219



1000



17120

U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
HORSHAM, PA  
18044  
AUG 19, 17  
AMOUNT

**\$6.59**

R2304N117449-01

**RETURN RECEIPT  
REQUESTED**

PA PV 6  
Attn: Rosemary Chianetta  
Commonwealth Keystone Bldg.  
400 North St. 2nd floor  
Harrisburg PA 17120

1712030205 0000

