

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Secretary: Rosemary Chiavetta

Mr. Amir V. Williams

v.

P. E. C. O.

Re: C-2018-3000734

AND NOW THIS DAY September 27, 2018 I, Mr. Amir V, Williams do hereby file the following "EXCEPTIONS" see, Christnan v. Emineth, N.D., 212 N.W. 2nd 543, 552. Also See, Fed.R. Civil P. 46. before the OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, Ms. Rosemary Chiavetta. The present Complaint arises out a previous complaint on and/or about 2016-17, before ALJ Marta Ghul, my Complaint before Judge Ghul, was "NOT ADJUDICATED FAIRLY" see, Miller v. Scobie, 152 Fla. 328, 11 So.2d892, 894.

It appears from my previous "Pro Se" Complaint and several other complainants' filings before the PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION against "Pennsylvanias Utility Companies" that the Pro Se Litigants are routinely not found in their favor, but instead are found in Favor of the "Utilities Companies" regardless of the weight of the evidence and/or the testimony presented to and/or before the ALJ' as "Proof" see, New England Newspaper Pub. Co. v. Bonner, C.C.A.Mass.,77 F.2d 915, 916. My previous complaint before the P. U. C. was found unworthy according in the ALJ's decision. In spite of my presenting two clear (2) "video-audio tapes" and two (2) my "sworn witnesses" supporting my Legal argument before the Court and entered in as evidence. Through some fancy-legal footwork the Court ruled against me in its decision, rendering my case moot and final.

BACKGROUND:

I am a 68 year old man living below the official poverty line, living on Social Security income. I live alone (except for approximately 1-2 weeks a month) in a one bedroom apartment. I practically live in the dark.

EXCEPTIONS:

- (1.) I asked for in writing for a FACE TO FACE HEARING before the P. U, C. This was denied to me.
- (2.) Denying "ME DUE PROCESS OF LAW" in my Right to Appeal the Courts decision.
- (3.) Limiting my answers to exceptions "ONLY."
- (4.) "NEW MATTER " not addressed and/or acknowledged by the Court before ALJ Marta Ghul, giving rise to the present case before ALJ Benjamin Meyers.
- (5.) Ignoring the preponderance of my witness testimony and the video/audio presentation to the Court.

- (6.) Taking the “UNETHICAL AND/OR BIASED POSITION” by the Court of saving time and money against further litigation. To make it seem as Though my Complaint “HAS NO CONSUMER MERIT” and is a waste of the P. U. C. ‘s and P. E. C. O. s’ time.
- (7.) “Denying my Request” in Court for the Transcript of my HEARING BEFORE ALJ Marta Ghul.” So that I might have had an “Equal Chance” just as P. E. C. O.s Attorney Shawnee Lee, had if in the event she had to continue with her presentation before any further action(s). With the ALJ’s, closing statement: that I would have to go to Harrisburg to read and/or use it.

Thank You,

Mr. Amir V, Williams

Signed X _____/s/_____

BACKGROUND: