

RECEIVED

NOV 26 2018

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

JANET E. COLE :  
 :  
v. :  
 :  
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY :

Docket No. C-2018-3003023

RECEIVED

NOV 21 2018

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

NOTICE  
AND  
PETITION FOR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

To: Judge Jeffrey A. Watson

This petition calls for clarification of jurisdiction of the Administrative Courts of  
the COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION:

Quoted from a letter signed by Rhonda L. Davidson, Assistant Counsel for the  
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION”

**“the exclusive method for a ratepayer or other person to initiate a complaint against  
a public utility is for the ratepayer to file a formal complaint with the Secretary of  
the Commission:”**

There are two issues of jurisdiction that the above statement by Rhonda Davidson  
Raises:

1. The instant formal complaint as filed is filed not by a person, but by a people, living and breathing with a soul, in Common Law, on the land, not in the territory. From Rhonda Davidson’s language, she implies that a ratepayer is a person. Does this court have jurisdiction to issue decisions for complaints other than by a person or is said jurisdiction limited to fictitious entities only?

2. The formal complaint as filed is not only against a utility, but also is against  
The COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY  
COMMISSION. Does this court have jurisdiction to order the PUC to  
**change policy, procedures, rules or rulings?**

Act 129 of 2008 is being improperly interpreted by the PUC. The word "shall" in Act 129 means there is no escape from the plain language meaning. The plain language of the act is "at the customer request." There is nothing in the statute or the history of the statute to think that "at the customer request" means anything but what it says and is only emphasized by the word "shall" that precedes it. I have presented this statute to numerous people and after reading it, the only ones who think that it is mandatory are some employees of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is a Maxim of Law that a statute be interpreted according to the language of the people, not the language of lawyers or utility companies. How else can people know what is required of them?

**Does this court have jurisdiction to order a change of interpretation of Act 129 of 2008?**

**If there is no response within ten (10) days, I will assume your silence is Admission that your court does not have jurisdiction over my claim.**

Dated: November 18, 2018

Janet E. Cole  
630 Euclid Avenue  
Temple, PA 19560  
(610) 929.4374

*Janet E Cole 11/23/18*

Janet E Cole  
Janet E. Cole

**RECEIVED**  
NOV 26 2018  
PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

~~RECEIVED~~  
2018 NOV 21 AM 10:30  
PA PUC  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

C-2018-3003023 – Janet E. Cole v. Metropolitan Edison Company

Filed with:  
Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary,  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-3265

First Class Mail

Copy to:  
Lauren Marissa Lepkoski Esquire  
Tori L. Gielser, Esquire  
First Energy Service Company  
2800 Pottsville Pike  
P.O. Box 1600  
Reading, PA 19612

Janet E. Cole  
630 Euclid Avenue  
Temple, PA 19560  
(610) 929.4374

~~RECEIVED  
2018 NOV 21 AM 10:30  
PA PUC  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU~~

**RECEIVED**


NOV 26 2018

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Janet E. Cole  
630 Euclid Avenue  
Temple, PA 19560

HARRISBURG PA 171

24 NOV 2018 PM 2 L



Rosemary Chiaveta, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, Pa 17105-3265

17105-326565

