

To: Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

From: Karen A. Feitt, and Higinio Mendoza, Jr.

Date: July 5, 2019

Re: Docket No. F-2017 - 2636316, Docket No. F-2018 - 3003833, and response to your email sent July 2, 2019, at 9:46 am

Attention, Mrs. Rosemary Chiavetta:

Thank you for your timely response, regarding our letter sent to you by faxed on July 1st, 2019, and as per your request, correspondence will be sent by (Certified) mail. Within your response mentioned in the email states that a formal complaint (Docket No. F-2017 - 2636316) was (adjudicated) dismissed by "Final Order" by the Commission (06/13/2019), and an appeal could be made to court if timely (06/15/2019) applied. However our rights was violated, and a fair trial was not conducted by your "Court, and you want us to obey an orders that is illegal. We will seek redress consisting of law (42 U. S. Code 1985, 1986), however we feel that it is more important that we would come to an agreement, settle that matter between the parties, establishing our attempt for settling before going to Court. Please reconsider the commissions (adjudicated (Docket No. F-2017 - 2636316) "ORDER", because it is just a "double standard" to state the least. Please keep in mind that an UN - Constitutional "Order" does not have to be "obeyed," as neither do any UN - Constitutional law. In all actuality factual case law cases is as follows, Mr. Justice Field delivered the opinion of the court, and stated "An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights, or duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office, it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2019

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Page 1 of 4

RECEIVED

JUL 10 2019

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

" The United States Supreme Court: NORTON V. SHELBY COUNTY (1886) No. 264

(notice that "VERDICT, "or "case law has never been overruled, overturned or set aside, so it still STANDS TODAY, as an "ORDER," to ALL others "DECISIONS," in all "LOWER" Courts. Which are "VOID," Unconstitutional" when used against we the people." We made mention to the commission in our pervious letter to you that the United States "SUPREME COURT" said it is an "ORDERED," Judgement of the Court of Appeals is affirmed. Therefore it is so ordered! Kindly, take notice "It is so ordered." Those words are a Command, witch equals the word, "ORDER." Therefore the SUPREME COURT DECISIONS do "ORDER" all of the "inferior pretend article - 3 - judicial - courts" below the US SUPREME COURT, to abide, obey, and agree to be controlled totally by their decisions on all of the same "Subject Matter." The word "Ruling," as in "Case Law" means it is to "RULE" the "LOWER /INFERIOR courts in this country establishing a "Standard," guide for all Courts "VERDICTS," Judgements, etc. If you feel this is an error, please consult with your legal department, attorneys, before we proceed. The Supreme Court established their final notice, and that is not an "if you feel like or don't feel like following THEIR "DECISION" it is an "ORDER" to do so, by THE SUPREME "RULING" AGENT. All "INFERIOR COURTS" are 100% "SUBJECT," and are "UNDER THE COMPLETE CONTROL" of the "United States SUPREME COURTS" DECISIONS, /VERDICTS, and MOST /SHALL COMPLY TO THE US SUPREME COURT DECISIONS/ VERDICTS, as their "deciding" factors, of all decision, of any "INFERIOR courts," are directly UNDER CASE "LAW" RULINGS. (LOOK UP the words "CASE LAW RULING," and then please "ABIDE BY IT,". The Commission, and "judges" court, or whatever they think to do or call themselves, "other-than-wise" at us, should

reconsider what The United States "SUPREME COURT" said, and that it is so "ORDERED!" Or suffer the risk, demise, down fall, triple damages, and up to prison time. We have suffered the consequences of the lack of the commission action mentioned above, furthermore the entity involved retaliated. In the month of June, 2019 we have three different bills, and two different bills for the month of July, 2019 from (Docket No. F-2017 – 2636316) Duquesne Light Company, with threats of shutting off our service are consistent. The Clayton Act provides: "Any person who shall be injured in his business or property by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws may sue therefor any district court of the United States and shall recover threefold the damages by sustained, and the cost of suit including a reasonable attorney's fees. Notice those 6 parts of a "Ruling " states what I am about, to describe to you consisting of, "No" immunity in any "Action for any reason," If your legal department would care only to read, and understand what those WORDS STATED.....that these cases (Docket No. F-2017 - 2636316, Docket No. F-2018 – 3003833) regarding the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, would STOP any, and or the (pretended) Judicial officer, or impede the "process", (Refer to 2, 4, 5, and 6, just below) or anyone, anything else connected to said (NONE) "jurisdictional" actors in your alleged court. "An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights, or duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office, it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed." As mentioned above, **The United States Supreme Court: NORTON V. SHELBY COUNTY (1886) No. 264** (NOTICE: that "VERDICT," OR "case LAW has never been overruled, overturned or set aside, so it still STANDS TODAY, as an "ORDER," to **ALL** other PRETENDED "DECISIONS," in all "LOWER" courts. Which are "VOID," and "Unconstitutional" when used against

we the people."

1. "An unconstitutional act is not a law... that really means it is "NOT a LAW!"
2. "It confers no rights," (on any so-called law enforcement, nor NON Trial courts.)
3. "It imposes no duties," (on "we the people." to abide by NOR "obey, nor be "Judged by.")
4. "It affords no protection," (Nope NO "law enforcement or "NON -Trial - courts, have "No immunity, NONE!").
5. "It creates no office," (gives "NO AUTHORITY," nor "jurisdiction" over anyone.)
6. "It is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."

Thank you for your time, consideration, we contemplate your cooperation, regarding this matter before the time set forth for an appeal to Commonwealth Court. We look forward in hearing from you soon.

Sincerely

Karen Feitt, and Higinio Mendoza, Jr.
(UCC 1-207 / UCC 1-308)

Karen Feitt, H. Mendoza, Jr.

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2019


PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

RECEIVED
PA PUB
SECRETARY'S BUREAU
2019 JUL 10 AM 10:33

Higinio Mendoza ON
1036 JACKMAN AVE
Pgh Pa. 15202

PITTSBURGH PA 150

25 JUL 2019 PM 11



Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
400 North Street 2nd floor
Harrisburg Pa. 17120

ATT: ROSEMARY
Chiarvetta

17120-009399

