

August 28, 2020

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

RE: **Docket Nos. F-2019-3008809 and F-2019-3008832**

Secretary Chiavetta:

This is a letter of notification that the Complainants' *Motion Requesting Permission to File Amended Main Brief and Motion in Opposition to Respondent's Motion for Sanctions* contained a typographical error. Specifically, in paragraph 9 of that document, the term 'Complaints' was intended to read 'Complainants'. A copy of the document which reflects the correction is attached.

Respectfully submitted,



Handwritten signatures of John Holder and Janet Holder in blue ink.

John Holder, Janet Holder

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

We hereby certify that true and corrected copies of Complainants' *Motion Requesting Permission to File Amended Main Brief* and *Motion in Opposition to Respondent's Motion for Sanctions* have been served upon the following persons in the manner indicated, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant):

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Kimberly A. Klock, Esq.
Michael J. Shafer, Esq.
PPL Services Corporation
Two North Ninth Street
Allentown, PA 18101

Devin T. Ryan, Esq.
Garrett P. Lent, Esq.
Post & Schell PC
17 North 2nd Street
12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601

Curtis Renner, Esq.
1901 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Suite 1005 ENS
Washington, DC 20006

Administrative Law Judge Elizabeth Barnes
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Date: August 28, 2020



**Complainants' Motion Requesting Permission
to File Amended Main Brief
and
Motion in Opposition
to Respondent's Motion for Sanctions**

1. As a separate motion in these proceedings, on August 25, 2020, the Complainants have filed a *Motion to Remove Sanctions* that previously have been imposed upon them and which unduly have deprived them of due process, which, in accordance with "the principles of common fairness," would have permitted them the "opportunity to be heard on the issues" (*Hess v. Pa. PUC*, 107 A.3d 246, 266 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2014)) and to "conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts." (66 Pa. C.S. § 332(c).)
2. On August 5, 2020, Respondent PPL Electric Utilities filed a *Motion to Strike the Complainants' Main Brief* and *Motion for Sanctions* against the Complainants.
3. In Section II, *Motion to Strike*, of Respondent's filing, the Respondent argues under Subsections A and B, respectively, that the Complainants' Main Brief is "premature" and "fails to comply with the Commission's regulations regarding the content and form required for briefs."
4. In Section II, *Motion to Strike*, of Respondent's filing, the Respondent argues under Subsections C and D, respectively, that the Complainants' Main Brief "improperly relies upon extra record evidence" and upon "previously excluded evidence."
5. The Complainants do not dispute the allegations made in Respondent's arguments referenced in ¶ 3, *supra*.
6. The Respondent's arguments referenced in ¶ 4, *supra*, are predicated entirely upon the sanctions that are referenced in ¶ 14 of Respondent's *Motion to Strike the Complainants' Main Brief* and in ¶ 1, *supra*, of this filing.

7. Notwithstanding, as pro se Complainants, we are not familiar with legal protocols or with the rules of procedure and propriety governing the content and form of documents. Our failure to comply with these rules and protocols is based entirely upon our lack of legal knowledge and informed judgment in this regard. Believing that we would be precluded, by the granting of Respondent's Motion in Limine, from submitting the affected exhibits as evidence, but not from merely referencing those or additional exhibits in our Main Brief, the Complainants did not fully and correctly understand the implications of the sanctions imposed.

8. Accordingly, the Complainants' filing of their Main Brief was entirely in error not only with respect to proper timing, but also with respect to permissible form and content.

9. The Complainants consequently have no objection to this Court's correct decision in already having stricken, during the Initial Hearing held on August 6, 2020, the Complainants' Main Brief from the record.

10. The Complainants therefore respectfully request permission to file, without sanctions, an Amended Main Brief which fully comports and complies with regulations regarding timing and the content and form required for briefs.

WHEREFORE,

For the foregoing reasons, the Complainants respectfully request permission from this Court to file, without sanctions, an Amended Main Brief which fully comports and complies with regulations regarding timing and the content and form required for briefs.

Respectfully submitted,

Handwritten signatures of John Holder and Janet Holder in blue ink. The signature of John Holder is on the left and Janet Holder is on the right. Both signatures are written in a cursive style.

John Holder, Janet Holder