

Liza Mousios v. Met Ed, March 25, 2019
Response and Preliminary Objections to
Metropolitan Edison Company

RECEIVED

APR 1 2019

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Docket:

2019-3007989

NOTE: Defendants Preliminary Objection
was not received until March 21, 2019

RECEIVED

1) Admitted

APR 20 2019

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

2) Objection. Act 129 was originally an
OPP-IV Statute and was not mandator
as to smart meter installation. Therefore
the Company is NOT in accordance with
Act 129.

3) Objection as the dates and facts are
in error. There was no correspondence
on or around January 22, 2019. There is
no memory of the web "release". No
field representative came to the
service location that day.

4) Objection. There is a violation of Title 66
PA Section 1501/1502, The Energy Policy
Act of 2005 § 1252, HB 2200 (8/8/17) (2/1/19)
and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

5) Since the facts in #4 are incorrect and
in violation of laws, complainant requests

a)

5) continued

a motion to strike against the company,
2) dismiss the Company's briefs in their
entirety with prejudice and 3) grant complainant
and neighborhood in solidarity the relief of
analog choice

b) Admitted.

7) Objection as the facts and dates
are in error. See # 3.

8) Note that Complainant filed by mail
and not electronically.

9) Admitted

10) Complainant is filing preliminary
objections under Pa. Code 5.101(a)
numbers 2 and 4.

The scandalous aspects are comprised
of subjecting Pennsylvania residents to health
damages, fires which have resulted in fatalities
and have been ascribed to smart meters by
fire chiefs and invasion of privacy.
Health hazards have been documented by
~~at least~~ 2000 scientific studies including
but not limited to the World Health Organization

10) continued. 3

The violation of original Act 129 PA 1501/1502, Energy Policy Act of 2005 § 1252, and AB 2200 of (7) (2) (C) and the violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act comprise Company's Legal Insufficiency of a pleading #4,

11) Unknown

12) Objection. As the Commission has rejected over 5400 complaints, it clearly has no interest where relief is warranted and free from doubt,

13) Objection as the Company is in violation per the aforementioned laws and the abrogation and violation of the intent of Act 129 which was an OPT-IN Act.

14) Objection as Complainant has stated that Ms. Mousios suffers from Electromagnetic HyperSensitivity, a fact documented by her physician, and Mr. Cumming has a high PSA reading and some hearing loss whereby Cancer risk and ear ringing and hearing loss are contraindicated by the smart meter.

(4)

14) Cont. Upon a confidentiality agreement, Ms. Mouscos will permit document from her physician indicating she must not have a smart meter, and Mr. Cummins will likewise permit a document from his doctor exhorting that he must not have a smart meter.

15) Objection. The entire neighborhood opposes the installation of smart meters. Thousands of Pennsylvanians have filed complaints and continue to oppose smart meters, as do millions of people worldwide.

Complainant challenges the legality of Company's bastardization of Act 129 as it is a OPT-IN Act, not a mandatory roll-out of smart meters.

Therefore, the Company's SMP is founded on a perversion of Act 129 and is also an insufficient pleading bastardization of the law.

16) Objections as this would demonstrate solipsistic, corrupt reciprocity between the Company and the Commission.

17.) Objection which incorporates all the preceding averments, scientific and fire studies, health problems of Complainant, violations of laws as previously stated.

18.) Objection. Because Act 129 is an OPT-IN law, THERE IS NOT A REQUIREMENT TO PROCURE AND INSTALL SMART METERS. Anything to the contrary is a venal, unctuous, spurious and reciprocal violation.

19.) Objection. A claim has been stated whereby relief can be granted and will be further elucidated at hearing with media present.

20.) OBJECTION. A hearing is necessary. Smart meters are not in the public interest. Any further attempt at extirpating rights will result in exhorting legislators and the media will be notified in any event.

21.) Objection. Since Ms. Mavrios is election sensitive (ESHS) these arguments seek of venal solipsistic corruption.

- 22) Objection. This is an Emperor's New Clothes argument and profoundly corrupt
- 23) Further objection. This begs the question of why citizens DO NOT WANT the smart meter
- 24) Objection as this indicates reciprocal unctuousness between the Commission and the Company,
- 25) Objection. It is illegal for a company to install a communications device without the express consent and financial reimbursement to the owner/resident.
- 26) Objection. Violation of original intent of Act 129, the Energy Policy Act of 2005 § 1252, Title 66 Section 1501/1502 the Energy Policy Act of 2005 § 1252, HB 2200L (a)(2) (i) and violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 27) Objection as the neighborhood is united in solidarity against smart meters.

28) Objection as the neighbors have requested Complainant's assistance in their opposition to smart meters.

29) Objection - See # 28

30) Objection. see # 28

31) Objection. There is nothing frivolous about being sickened by EMFs or in a fire (there have been fatalities) or having privacy invasions.

32) Complainant can assert a claim on behalf of others who have requested such assistance and because the electromagnetic toxicity travels and augments via the mesh technology among various smart meters.

Conclusion

Complainant requests that Metropolitan Edison's objections be stricken and the Complainant's objections be upheld.

March 25, 2019

Brief received March 21, 2019

Resubmitted
By
Za Mousa

3/25/2019

Resubmitted April 17, 2019