

DEC 8 2020

P.A. PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

<u>HOME ADDRESS</u>	<u>TEMPORARY ADDRESS</u> J.M.J.
446 Commonwealth Ave West Mifflin, Pennsylvania '15122	311 Case Avenue Sharon, Pennsylvania 15146 November 10, 2020

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary PUC Commission	C-2019-3012955
-------------------------------------------------	----------------

Keystone Bldg, 2nd floor W 400 N. Street Harrisburg, Pa., 17120	<u>EXCEPTIONS</u>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

In my letter to your office, dated October 9, 2020, citing my reactions to your letter of transmittal, dated September 30, 2020, I'm crying out loud my factual responses, again. Your letter of September 30, 2020, a front page single copy is dated 60 days after Docket C-2019-Number, page 9.

I request my paragraph 2, letter dated October 9, 2020, be read how 20 days(?) become unfair in so many ways compared to your total reports of almost 400 days with no replies whatsoever.

Furthermore, you have not responded to my October letter for a legitimate extension requested.

In your letter of transmittal dated September 30, 2020, reference last paragraph re: "how" --- the decision of the Administrative Law Judge could become final (without final) without further Commission action.

I remember a one line closed letter early in which he said the case was closed (WAS CLOSED), now over 400 days since, you are sending me this letter, dictating instructions which defy the logic of legal respect. I AM SHOCKED! In the U.S. AIR FORCE, this whole episode would be tagged as "Dobble-de-Book," meaning ???

Look, please, at your letter of transmittal paragraph 3 and 4... what do "requisite" @ pa gov signify or mean? 4 = none so makes no sense to me. And paragraph 5 = the 10 day mandate! And paragraph 6 dictating me commitments, etc. etc!

When Mr. Koy's one line letter, I understood it! "Closed" means what it says, "not a swinging door." Never to expect this report.

I am requesting with very serious concern over your letter, and his claims of interpretation of our meeting, that he send me a copy of the lady's <sup>TRANSCRIPT</sup> record of notes she took. I have good recall of his comments that were restrictive in procedure without any ground rules to follow - all of which were in my report but was denied which led to confusion and ~~in~~admissible reportings. This happened 2 or 3 times of denial.

From henceon, all other remarks as hypothetical, partially referential, bias  
P 2 of 8

IP = PARAGRAPH (A GREEK LETTER) used.

in reporting, partial and important points not referenced and omitted, minimal discussions

about topics presented, cut short when statements were challenging, etc., etc., your report reflects no references to my comments recorded by the Judge which impacted my offense remarks.

In other words these parts <sup>were</sup> not reported in pp 3-4.

Nowhere in your letter or his report is there a respect for using language foreign to English for me. e.g. IP's 3-4, your letter, IP 6 and IP 7 and IP 8. P. 2 - IP 3 "collateral estoppel," IP 4 p. 2 "intervalis," IP 5 "pro se," and p. 3 Transcript Tr. 53-54, p. 4 referencing what was in first hearing as in "out of bounds" permission by the Judge. "prima facie," "id."

P. 5, last paragraph, he referenced prior complaints in the periods in which I was not permitted to present for clarification. Also, the last paragraph, he did not qualify the example I used as reason for distribution charges to me. Issues involving incorrect charges.

P. 6 IP 1 previous year's quotes but denied same in present hearing.

Nowhere does he try to prove failures presented in both meetings having any bearing discussed.

I challenge his remarks made in  
top paragraph p. 7... implications, assumptions,  
opinions, etc. in the use of "may" line 1,  
and lines 3 and 4 "his prior pattern"; "one  
may consider (line 4); "... the number of  
occupants residing in the household -- the  
potential for energy utilization, and any  
non-relevant facts or circumstances that  
come to light during the proceedings --  
all of what never was discussed, alluded  
to, or referenced, etc, etc. (6 and other...)  
et cetera!

Page 7, TP 2 7 lines for sentence!  
what did this say? nothing more  
than an implied <sup>idea</sup> for legality but not  
to my complaint. Also, a total of 11 lines.  
All on assumption, hypotheses, supposition  
etc. Page 7, last paragraph I was  
shut down in writing to make an  
explanation but denied to minimize  
any opportunity to prove myself. Still more  
supposition - "alleges did not occur..."

Page 8 "Conclusions of Law"  
are obvious statements because of the  
denials from me. Certain laws addressed  
do not make a thing right or wrong. Ethics  
prove that something is right or wrong  
by its nature - a moral issue not  
an opinion.

Reference letter dated Nov. 8, 2019, page 1  
on bottom where someone informed me of replacing the  
meter when I was informed prior to installation. BECAUSE  
They did (DLC) leave a notice in my mailbox to inform  
me when a new meter would be installed for my account  
to control power usage in related power outlets, e.g.  
(for sake of example). None notified me! They just  
showed up, replaced the meter causing power  
usage in related power outlets especially my furnace  
motor. Furthermore, when I had returned home,  
my furnace motor was running after meter installation  
for several days until I discovered and heard the  
furnace motor running. DLC denied this happening!  
I invited DLC to send an engineer or electrician to  
my house 3-4 times but none showed up. This same  
restriction of power upon replacement happened a  
2nd time during an electrical storm in our area on  
Commonwealth Avenue in West Mepkin's Homeville area.  
The furnace operated again for days while away.  
Again, I invited DLC workers to my home to  
verify this storm outage occurring. No calls! no  
visits! No responses from DLC. Wouldn't this  
make anyone angry --- ANGRY --- unhappy --- irritated?  
Continue reading the rest of that letter!

Back to the exceptions!

Page 2 of basic letter, TP 5, Attorney Farah  
asked a fellow worker to identify 5 exhibits of bills  
in evidence - no different than was exhibited via  
format at the earlier meeting. But they got their  
moment!

Refine P 6 top of p 3. verbage to prove nothing; it was taken under advisement and now fully addressed or partially.

P 7 2 lines - case closed !!! and no more discussion for months to my surprise.

Findings of fact.

IP's 3 and 4 prove my ~~presence~~ of electricity.

IP 5 - Withdrawn - request for payment because my absence were quite obvious that were absolutely futile to deliberate.

IP 6 A contradiction of presentation: During the presentation I was not permitted to bring up any reference from the previous meeting but the judge had his prerogative to "hear fruit."

IP 7 My monthly bills are not - repeat - absent or the readings alone.

Under the paragraph of "discussing" about every bill had on the reverse side of said communication the warning of "termination." Again he resurrects from the past - hearing that which I was prevented from presenting data, all because I didn't know how to handle budget needs. Because "Uncle Sam" denied my social security in 1958-1959 because I did not pay in advance for 2 years, 1956-1957 and 1957-1958. In 1958-1959 teachers were available to receive social security but social security only became effective in 1958-1959. their imposing on  
p 6 of 8

"ex post facto" (after the fact) law on me  
because I could not afford the payback. (Earning

#2000 in 1956-1957 and #2200 in 1957-1958) When I was  
separated from the Air Force and just coming out  
of the "DEPRESSION" after losing our home in 1937  
and Dad in 1939, then living in a <sup>small</sup> ~~small~~ <sup>cellar</sup> for 6<sup>+</sup> years  
with the 4 sons and Mom. And on -- and on!

I received a monthly social security check of (c) \$160<sup>00</sup>.

As far as the TP 7 pp 6 and 7 (top) there is  
his entry of a possible high bill by presuming  
it being "abnormally high compared to price usage patterns."

My bills reflect this when I am out of my house, away,  
OR -- number of occupants residing <sup>in</sup> the household,  
etc." Let it be known, a widower, unemployed for

25<sup>+</sup> years AND not one person or visitor or stranger --  
not 1 has ever been in my house -- none -- ever!

Even 2-3 visits from my children who live miles  
away! Compare the invoices for contrast!

Enough is enough!

Read thoroughly my letter of November 8, 2019  
especially pp 7-10. None of my remarks have reached  
"home"! I am tired of repeating and multiplying  
remarks for your understanding and the Commission.

A.T. Commercial highlights my feelings "Pay for  
what you get" or is it "you get what you pay for."

Lastly, as reported in Nov. 8, 2019:

At the gas station I insert the gas hose into  
my tank, but if I don't squeeze the trigger do I  
have to pay for the gas in the hose? Of course not!

Furthermore, the wires are expending  
my property from street to meter, for so-called  
distribution. Distribution is another word  
like truck transportation of grocery, et al (et aliter)  
(and other) to grocery stores, or wherever,

In closure, I am sorry to say that  
I do not understand at all your letter of transmission  
"so many 'do's and don'ts'" that I truly do  
not comprehend... TRUTHFULLY.

Sincerely,

A. Raymond Kachis

P.S. My daughter has an airline  
ticket for my visit to her house at this  
address  
Marybeth Kachis  
191 Shields Avenue  
Angel Fire, New Mexico

Better yet:

87710

Please send all mail for me to my  
daughter:

Colleen Goodwin

311 Case Avenue

Sharon, Pa., 16146

My flight leaves at 9 AM, Friday, November 20,  
I'm scheduled to return December 29, 2020

ARK.  
300 CASE Ave.  
SHARON, PA.  
16146

PITTSBURGH PA 150

16 NOV 2020 PM 5 L



ATTN  
MISS JOYCE

Rosemary Chiavetta  
Secretary.

Keystone Bldg. 2nd floor n  
400 N. Street

Harisburg, Pennsylvania

17120

17120-021199

